| Case 1:21-cr-00265-PKC |  |   |
|------------------------|--|---|
|                        |  | <b>4927</b> 1933                                      |
| 1                      | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT<br>EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK   |   |
| 2                      |  | x<br>21-CR-265 (PKC)                                  |
| 3                      | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA   | ·   |
| 4                      |  | Brooklyn, New York                                    |
| 5                      | -against-  | June 14, 2023<br>9:00 a.m.                            |
| 6                      | MICHAEL MCMAHON ET AL.,  | 9.00 a.m.   |
| 7                      | Defendants.  |   |
| 8                      | x  |   |
| 9                      | TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR TRIAL BEFORE THE HONORABLE PAMELA K. CHEN                           |   |
| 10                     | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE   |   |
| 11                     |  | BEFORE A JURY   |
| 12                     | APPEARANCES  |   |
| 13                     | For the Government:  | ,   |
| 14                     |  | UNITED STATES ATTORNEY Eastern District of New York   |
| 15                     |  | 271 Cadman Plaza East<br>Brooklyn, New York 11201     |
| 16                     |  | BY: CRAIG R. HEEREN, ESQ. MEREDITH ASHLEY ARFA, ESQ.  |
| 17                     |  | IRISA CHEN, ESQ.<br>Assistant United States Attorneys |
| 18                     | For Defendant McMahon:   | LAWRENCE S. LUSTBERG, ESQ.                            |
| 19                     |  | GENNA AUTUMN CONTI, ESQ.                              |
| 20                     | For Defendant Zheng:   | PAUL A. GOLDBERGER, ESQ.<br>RENEE MELINDA WONG, ESQ.  |
| 21                     | For Defendant Zhu:   | KEVIN K. TUNG, ESQ.                                   |
| 22                     | Court Reporter:  | AVERY N. ARMSTRONG, RPR, NYRCR                        |
| 23                     |  | Phone: 718-613-2419  Fax: 718-613-2639                |
| 24                     |  | Email: Aarm.edny@gmail.com                            |
| 25                     | Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription. |   |

the same order that's in the indictment order. And -- but I will be honest and tell you, I have not spoken to either Mr. Goldberger or Mr. Tung about that. So if they change their mind right now, I'm wide open.

24

video exhibits, will put them on a flash drive and will give

So ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I

THE COURT:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

1937

hope you had a good and restful evening. As I mentioned yesterday, we are going to hear from the parties with respect to their summations which are, as I told you at the start of the trial, their argument and their interpretation of the evidence that they're going to urge to you. So we'll start off with the Government summation, then each of the defendants will have a chance to make their summations, and then the Government will go last with rebuttal, because, as you know, it's their burden of proof, so they always go last. So I gather that Ms. Arfa will give the opening summation for the Government. Ms. Arfa. And let me just say this, ladies and gentlemen: remind you that all, the exhibits that have been admitted have been sent back to you. So you can review them to the extent any party references them during their closing statements and then if at any point you need any portion of the transcript sent back to you, a witness' testimony or something like that, you can also request that during your deliberations. All right. Go ahead, Ms. Arfa. MS. ARFA: Good morning. THE JURY: Good morning. MS. ARFA: For almost three years, Xu Jin and his wife, Liu Fang were terrorized by the Chinese Government.

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

That happened here in the United States where they live. The Chinese Government wanted Xu Jin and Liu Fang to return to China so the Chinese Government, using a number of different people, including each of the defendants, and every person on this board, harassed and stalked and threatened Xu Jin and Liu Fang and their families.

Strangers went to the home of Liu Fang's sister-in-law in New Jersey. They did it in order to deliver messages to Xu Jin. One of those messages is, If you want to protect your family, the only options are to return to China or kill yourself.

Xu Jin's sick, elderly father was sent halfway across the world from China to New Jersey to try to force Xu Jin to return to China. Xu Jin's father made that long, dangerous trip because of threats to the safety of his own wife and daughter back in China.

Strangers went to the home of Xu Jin and Liu Fang, pounded on their door, tried to open that door, and then left a threatening note. The note said that if Xu Jin returned to China and if he spent 10 years in prison there, then his wife and his child would be safe.

A stranger sent harassing Facebook messages to the friends of Xu Jin and Liu Fang's daughter and then there was a flood of mail sent from China to Liu Fang's sister, mail that included a video with images of Xu Jin's mother and sister

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

1 hysterically crying.

Liu Fang and her daughter checked in with each other every single day, sometimes doing something as simple as just texting an emoji to the other, just to confirm that the other was still safe. This was a relentless campaign by the Chinese Government to scare Xu Jin and Liu Fang into returning to China.

And each of the defendants, Michael McMahon,
Zhu Yong and Congying Zheng, knowingly participated in that
campaign. They surveilled, they stalked, they threatened, and
they terrified. What the defendants did was against the law,
and it's time to hold them accountable for their conduct.

Ladies and gentlemen, when this trial began, the Government told you that the evidence would show that each of the defendants knowingly acted at the direction of the Chinese Government and that they stalked the victims in this case.

The evidence that you have seen and heard has proven exactly that.

This morning, I'll summarize that evidence for you.

And I'll explain how it demonstrates that each of the

defendants is guilty of each of the four charged crimes. I'm

not going to review everything because I know you paid

attention. And, as Judge Chen said, you'll have the evidence

when you deliberate and you can request the transcripts of the

witness testimony.

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

I will briefly note, though, that on my slides, those won't be in evidence so they won't go back with you. So if there's a particular exhibit you would like to review more closely, you should write down the exhibit number. It will be on the bottom of the slide. In a moment, I'll walk you through the key events.

As you've heard over the past two weeks, these events are largely undisputed. After I've talked about the key events, I'll talk about the charges against the defendants, what those charges mean, and how we have proved each of those charges beyond a reasonable doubt.

As I do that, I'll focus on what really are the issues in dispute here, defendant's knowledge, and their intent.

As you learned over the past two weeks, the Chinese Government, through the work of the defendants and their co-conspirators, carried out a multiyear campaign to harass and intimidate the victims in order to coerce them to return to China. In September 2016, the Chinese Government directed Defendant Zhu Yong to hire Defendant Michael McMahon, a private investigator and former NYPD officer, to locate Xu Jin.

Looks like it's cut off on the screen, but that's a timeline bubble for September 2016. Zhu Yong, who was in direct contact with Chinese Government official, Sun Hui,

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

right over here where the political commissar are in China,
Zhu Yong hired McMahon to locate Xu Jin and his family. It
was Zhu Yong who signed McMahon's retainer agreement. It was
also Zhu Yong who initially paid McMahon. This is the
retainer agreement.

And as you can see here, this is GX 1020, Zhu Yong already possessed highly sensitive information about the victims, including, as you can see -- well, maybe you can see. It's pretty small, their social security number, their birth dates, and their green card numbers. And at the bottom of that first page and top of that second page, you can also see that he possessed information that related to Chinese travel information.

Ladies and gentlemen, that was information that could only have come from the Chinese Government. That highly sensitive information in that document is why, beginning in October 2016, Zhu Yong provided to Michael McMahon to help him track down the victims. As we'll discuss later, McMahon knew exactly what was going on right from the beginning. He did some basic research and he almost immediately found a newspaper article and other information that made clear, exactly why he had been hired to find Xu Jin. It was because the Chinese Government wanted to arrest Xu Jin and force him to return to China.

Bless you.

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

Despite learning that Xu Jin was wanted by the Chinese Government, in early October 2016, McMahon began researching Xu Jin and conducting surveillance of Xu Jin's family. McMahon was doing that for Zhu Yong, the defendant, and for his Chinese Government counters. As you can see here, this is GX 1034, '36, and '37, McMahon surveilled Xu Jin's sister—in—law and took photos of her. McMahon sent those photos to the interpreter who then passed them on to Zhu Yong. And you can see that in this e—mail in which the interpreter informed McMahon that his update had been provided to Mr. Zhu.

In late October, the Chinese Government officials directing this scheme escalated their efforts. They began a

directing this scheme escalated their efforts. They began a more hands-on approach. On October 27, Zhu Yong and his co-conspirator, Hu Ji, right here, the Chinese police officer, traveled from China to meet with McMahon.

That meeting happened, as you heard, at a Panera Bread in New Jersey. Zhu Yong and Hu Ji both traveled to the United States in late October. That's confirmed in this exhibit, GX 402Y. And the day leading up to that meeting at Panera Bread with McMahon, Zhu and Hu Ji, they spoke many times. You can see that in GX 316.

The meeting at Panera Bread was captured in this photo of the three conspirators, standing arm in arm. The photo is GX 902E. This is Defendant McMahon in the middle, Defendant Zhu Yong on the left and Hu Ji, the Chinese police

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

officer on the right.

Zhu Yong and Hu Ji didn't travel from China to New Jersey just to take a quick photo. The reason for the meeting was obvious. They wanted to have a detailed conversation about the ongoing plan to harass Xu Jin and Liu Fang in order to force them to return to China.

In November 2016, McMahon began receiving direction directly from the Chinese Government, via Eric Yan, who, as you know, is the same Hu Ji, the Chinese police officer with whom McMahon had met only a few weeks previously at the Panera Bread. The information requested from McMahon became even more invasive and more obviously geared toward harassment and intimidation.

For example, Hu Ji requested that McMahon obtain
Liu Fang's travel information and information about their
college-aged daughter. McMahon provided that information as
you can see, in GX 2033. The information that McMahon
provided, as I'll talk about more later, included sensitive
U.S. Government information about people living here in the
United States.

McMahon improperly got that information from a law enforcement friend and then gave it to a Chinese Government official. And while McMahon was conducting surveillance and gathering sensitive personal information about the victims, another man conveyed to the victims exactly what the Chinese

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

Government was doing.

That man passed along a message for Xu Jin that to protect his family, his only options were to return to China or kill himself. This is Liu Yan's testimony. As she told you, he said, If you don't go back, then your family members will be in trouble. If you want to resolve this issue, there's only two ways: Either you go back to China on your own and admit the crime or you disappear.

And then she told you what that meant. What disappear meant. She told you that meant asking him to die on his own. That's Pages 78 to 79 in the transcript. And that right there is the Chinese Government ratcheting up the pressure.

In December 2016, McMahon sent Hu Ji a report about Xu Jin's daughter. During her testimony, Xu Jin's daughter identified most of the addresses in the reports that McMahon sent as addresses of which she had lived previously. You can see that in these exhibits, GX 3063, 3065, 713, and Sabrina Xu's testimony at Pages 15 to 16.

In the spring of 2017, the Chinese Government escalated things further. That's when Chinese Government officials, together with McMahon and several conspirators, exploited the victim's elderly father to locate and harass the victims. In March 2017, Hu Ji told McMahon about this new phase of the harassment campaign, Hu Ji told McMahon that

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

Xu Jin's father would be traveling from China to New Jersey to the home of Liu Fang's sister and asked McMahon to follow

Xu Jin's father in order to try to find Xu Jin himself. Hu Ji asked McMahon whether he would accept this job or not. You

can see it in the exhibits. McMahon accepted.

On April 3rd, 2017, Tu Lan -- Tu Lan, the Chinese prosecutor who was tasked with bringing Xu Jin back to China, she traveled from China to New Jersey, along with co-conspirator Johnny Zhu, right down here. They met with Hongru Jin who, as you heard, acted among other things as a driver for the various Chinese officials when they came to the United States in connection with this harassment campaign.

The co-conspirators gathered in a hotel, and they discussed the plan to harass and surveil Xu Jin and his family. And we know that because a lengthy portion of the meeting was recorded. The plan they discussed that night involved a number of participants and it occurred over several days.

The plan was this: Xu Jin's father would fly into the United States, and he would do so along with a doctor, to ensure that the elderly man would survive the trip. Johnny Zhu would take the father to the home of Xu Jin's sister-in-law and then leave him there. The father would then try contacting Xu Jin to convey the Chinese Government's demands that Xu Jin return to China. And while all of this

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

was happening, McMahon and Hongru Jin would be performing surveillance in order to try to locate Xu Jin and figure out where he lived by following his father. At that meeting at the hotel, Chinese prosecutor Tu Lan and Johnny Zhu discussed McMahon.

Tu Lan was emphatic. She directed Johnny Zhu to tell McMahon everything. She said, and I quote, Tell him clearly, I mean, you need to tell him clearly about everything. You can see that in GX 704A.

The next day, on April 4th, 2017, the team began carrying out that plan. Johnny Zhu met with McMahon at the same place he had met with Zhu Yong and Hu Ji previously, the Panera bread in New Jersey. They met for nearly an hour. You can conclude that at that meeting, just as Tu Lan directed, Johnny Zhu told McMahon everything. And to ensure that McMahon would carry out his role in this obviously illegal scheme, Johnny Zhu paid McMahon \$5,000 in cash.

On April 5th, 2017, Xu Jin's father arrived in the United States as planned. This is Xu Jin's father, Xu Cewei. At the time, he was 82 years old, and he had recently suffered a brain hemorrhage. He was forced to travel to the United States accompanied by Dr. Li Minjun, a retired doctor.

Xu Jin's father was given a task, find his son,
Xu Jin, and persuade Xu Jin to return to China. That task was
given to him by Tu Lan, the Chinese prosecutor. And you heard

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA 1947 about that task from Liu Fang in her own words. testified, He, meaning her father-in-law, said that Tu Lan and others forced him to come to the U.S., he did not want to come, and he was also given a task, he must return to China with his son, yeah, to persuade his son to return to China. And then she clarified what that task was. She told you, they wanted him to meet with his son, and he must see him, and he has to persuade the son to return to China with him together. That's Liu Fang's testimony, Pages 697 to '99. The reason Xu Jin's father made that dangerous trip was because he feared for the safety of his wife and his daughter in China. His daughter, in fact, had previously been jailed when Xu Cewei, the father refused to make the trip. That's his daughter right there who's Xu Jin's sister, Xu Qin. Let's look what Xu Jin told you about that. He said, And Tu Lan from the prosecutor's office in Wuhan told my father that if he did not accompany them to the U.S., then my younger sister would be sent to jail. Page 1392 of the transcript. After he arrived in the United States, Xu Jin's father was dropped off at the home of Xu Jin's sister-in-law, just as the conspirators planned. Xu Jin's father was literally left on her door. That's Liu Yan, sister-in-law.

The reason the Chinese Government officials left the father at the home of the sister-in-law was because they didn't have an address for Xu Jin. They had his

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

sister-in-law's address, though, and so they used Xu Jin as bait. And the plan worked. Because Michael McMahon was watching. He followed Xu Jin's father to a meeting with Xu Jin and then he followed Xu Jin home from that meeting.

By April 6th, just one day after Xu Jin's father arrived in the United States, McMahon was able to do what the Chinese Government had not been able to do thus far, he was able to locate Xu Jin.

This is McMahon texting Johnny Zhu with Xu Jin's address. That's the redacted box there. But you can see the un-redacted version in GX 805B. And GX 2002 is a photo of Xu Jin's home that McMahon sent to Johnny Zhu that very day. McMahon, of course, knew the overall purpose of this multiday scheme. He knew the purpose was to coerce Xu Jin to return to China. And when the scheme wasn't progressing quickly enough, he suggested more direct meshes. On April 11, 2017, he texted Johnny Zhu, I think if we harass Xu, park outside his home and let him know we are there, I did that before on another case. That's GX 805B.

And let's be clear about what we're talking about here. This is Michael McMahon suggesting to a representative of the Chinese Government that they harass Xu Jin, in those words, because if an appeal from an elderly man forced to travel halfway around the world wasn't going to be enough to convince Xu Jin, then perhaps knowing that an armed

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

1 investigator was sitting right outside would be enough.

2 Perhaps that would be the thing that scared him back to China.

Johnny Zhu said no to that particular harassment technique,

4 but the Chinese Government did continue its harassment

5 campaign. They just did it through other methods of stalking

and intimidation, and they continued to use McMahon to do it.

The next day, Xu Jin's father was permitted to return to his wife and his daughter in China. But Xu Jin didn't go with him and so the Chinese Government's efforts continued. Less than two weeks later, Hu Ji, again, the Chinese police officer, e-mailed McMahon to thank him for getting Xu Jin's address. And then he said that now we needed information in connection with the girl related to Xu Jin's daughter.

Having located Xu Jin, there was no legitimate purpose for seeking information about Xu Jin's daughter. This was about continuing to find ways to harass Xu Jin. Zhu Yong went to the home of Xu Jin's sister-in-law and took photos.

And you can see here this is a photo that includes her license plate. And these were photos that were found on his phone.

And just a few days after taking these photos, Defendant Zhu Yong returned to China. We know that from the travel record, you can see.

And then a month later, there was yet another effort to harass Xu Jin. This time it was targeted at his daughter,

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

1950

1 Sabrina. That's Sabrina, who also goes by Xu Xinzi. 2 messages were sent to her friends accusing her parents of wrongdoing and accusing her of benefiting from that 3 In the summer of 2018, her friends starting 4 wronadoina. 5 receiving those messages, disparaging her and her family. And, as she testified, she felt threatened that the Chinese 6 7 Government had found her friends and sent those messages. 8 told you that the messages made her feel stressed and unsafe. 9 She told you they made her feel worried about her family. 10 That's GX 713 at Pages 22 to 23. In September 2018, the Chinese Government finally 11 12 agreed with McMahon and further escalated their threats. 13 Taking advantage of the address for Xu Jin that McMahon had 14 obtained, the Chinese Government sent two people to his home 15 to threaten and intimidate him. On September 4th, 2018, Defendant Congying Zheng, 16 17 along with Vincent Kuang, drove from Brooklyn to New Jersey to deliver another message from the Chinese Government. 18 19 Defendant Zheng, leading the charge, walked up Xu Jin's 20 driveway, went to his front door, pounded on that front door. 21 When no one answered, and he couldn't open the door because it 22 was locked, he taped to the door three threatening notes. And 23 then he let Kuang to the back of the house, walking up the 24 backyard and up the patio where, as you can see from those 25 exhibits which are GX 709A and 108, he peered inside their

(Continued on the following page.)

23

22

24

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1 (Continuing.)

MS. ARFA: But even though they were scared, Xu Jin and Liu Fang still didn't return to China, and the Chinese Government's efforts continued.

In 2019, Liu Fang's sister, Liu Yan, started receiving numerous unsolicited and unwanted mailings from China. They supposedly were from Xu Jin's sister. But Liu Fang's sister, and Xu Jin and Liu Fang themselves, knew better. They knew that those mailings were the latest in the Chinese Government's efforts to try to force Xu Jin and his wife to return to China.

These were some of the mailings. This is GX 5072 and 506. You saw the contents of one of those mailings, that DVD. That was the video you saw a few days ago. That was the video of Xu Jin's mother and sister crying. It was deeply upsetting, just as it was supposed to be.

Ladies and gentlemen, the events I just described make clear that Xu Jin and Liu Fang were harassed and stalked for years. This was a broad and long-lasting experience to coerce Xu Jin and Liu Fang to return to China through threats and intimidation.

Every person on this board, including the defendants, played a role in this conspiracy. Every one of them shared the goal of harassing Xu Jin and Liu Fang into going back to China. The defendants each participated in that

Summation - Ms. Arfa

overarching conspiracy. They played different roles at different times, but they were all involved. They all shared that common goal. In doing so, the defendants each committed four separate crimes. Those crimes fall into two buckets.

First: The defendants each acted as an illegal agent of a foreign government; and separately, they conspired to commit that crime.

Second: The defendants each committed the crime of interstate stalking; and separately, they conspired to commit that crime.

I've talked generally about what the evidence in this trial has shown. In a moment, I'll walk through how the evidence proves each defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt on each of those four charges. As I do that, I'll discuss some of the law, which I expect Judge Chen will instruct you about. To the extent anything I say is inconsistent with anything Judge Chen instructs you, you, of course, should please follow Judge Chen's instructions.

I'm going to start with the interstate stalking charges, which are relatively straightforward.

The evidence has shown that the defendants each shared a common goal of harassing and intimidating Xu Jin and Liu Fang. That's exactly what each of them did. And just to be clear, neither of these two charges requires proof that the defendants knew that they were working at the direction of the

If you find those elements satisfied, you must find

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1 | the defendants guilty of this count.

But to find the defendants guilty of this count,

Count Three, you do not need to find that anyone actually

carried out the interstate stalking, the interstate

intimidation, the harassment. Here, it's the agreement itself

to harass or to intimidate that's the crime.

Let's look now at each of the defendants, starting with the evidence that proves that McMahon and Zhu Yong engaged in interstate stalking.

As you know, Zhu Yong and McMahon were primarily responsible for the scheme to bring Xu Jin's father from China to New Jersey to coerce the victims to return to China. As we told you in our opening, McMahon himself did not travel between states or internationally, but he clearly aided and abetted others who did so, including Johnny Zhu and Tu Lan, and he did that with the intent of harassing the victims and causing them substantial emotional distress.

McMahon's agreement to stalk Xu Jin when his father arrived was critical to Tu Lan's plan to finally find Xu Jin's home address. As we talked about earlier this morning, in October 2016, the evidence shows that Zhu Yong traveled back and forth from China to the United States and back again. And he did that as he helped the Chinese Government officials, like Hu Ji, gather information that the Chinese Government could use to carry out its stalking scheme against the

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1 victims.

Zhu Yong put the wheels in motion for the April 2017 surveillance in early October 2016. As you saw, during this period, Zhu Yong was already sending McMahon information on Xu Jin's father. He knew the goal was to lever Xu Jin's father to coerce Xu Jin to return to China. You can see on here, this is the information sheet that he provided to McMahon. It says: Jin Xu's parents will leave the states on October 6th, and it provides information about their travel plans. Then it suggests that someone follow them.

And, in fact, Zhu Yong admitted to knowing about this scheme in his post-arrest interview.

As you know, later in October, both Hu Ji and Zhu
Yong traveled from China to the United States in order to meet
with McMahon. After that meeting, McMahon provided
information he improperly obtained from databases for the U.S.
Department of Homeland Security about the victims, and he
passed that information to Chinese officials for use in
further actions.

In April 2017, several more conspirators, working alongside McMahon and with information and resources gathered by Zhu Yong, again traveled across international and state borders, this time with Xu Jin's father, and this time, clearly to engage in direct harassment and intimidation.

McMahon may not have traveled outside of New Jersey

You see Gallowitz asked: Further surveillance?

McMahon responds: Not sure. Waiting for a call

Gallowitz responds: Yeah, from New Jersey State

Police about an abduction.

McMahon responds: LOL. Laugh out loud.

22

23

24

25

You also saw a text in which Gallowitz proposed to

And when McMahon was asked about his role in stalking the victims, he lied about what he did and he pretended that communication you just saw, the one in which he suggested harassing Xu, was a typo.

McMahon: I don't know why I would even say something like that unless it was a typo or something.

20

21

22

23

24

25

It wasn't a typo. It was McMahon trying to cover

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1 his tracks.

The interstate and foreign travel here is obvious.

The intent to intimidate and harass is clear. And of course, the expectation of substantial emotional distress from the coordinated scheme involving Xu Jin's father was not just reasonable to expect; it was the entire purpose of the scheme. And it wasn't just a purpose; it actually happened.

This element is proven.

As you heard from Xu Jin, his father was elderly and in poor health. In fact, as I told you, he was -- or as he told you, Xu Jin told you, his father was in such poor health that even the Chinese Government had a retired doctor to accompany him. They were worried he might die. And if he did die, he wouldn't be able to accomplish the Chinese Government's mission.

The father's forced trip to New Jersey from China was shocking and distressing to Xu Jin's entire family. He told you: It was because earlier in that year my father had the surgery done and his health condition had been weakened, and previously he had a brain hemorrhage and started saying that he's getting headaches. My family members were very concerned and worried about his conditions. However, under such conditions, he was still being forced to come to the U.S. It was very shocking. The first of all, it was very shocking for me to see that being done and, secondly, I was very angry.

The forced visit of Xu Jin's father made absolutely clear that every day that Xu Jin did not return to China, his family would suffer more and more. Because of that, Xu Jin told you that he lives in fear.

He said: When my father returned to China, they sent my younger sister to the jail again.

QUESTION: And does that make you feel frightened?
Yes, I'm worried.

Substantial emotional distress is proven.

Let's talk now about the evidence related to Zheng's guilt of interstate stalking. That evidence is also clear-cut. Congying Zheng and Vincent Kuang drove an hour in their car from Brooklyn to New Jersey to the Xu family home.

The interstate travel element is proven.

When they got there, Congying Zheng and Vincent Kuang invaded the property of Xu Jin and Liu Fang, and they posted the threatening notes. I showed you earlier the note they left. And make no mistake, defendant Zheng was not an unwilling follower, as he falsely claimed in his post-arrest interview. He was first one up the driveway. He was the first one to the front door. He was the first one on the deck. He was the one holding the table dispenser. And he was the person who taped the note on the door, the note that threatened the safety of Xu Jin and his entire family. When Zheng did that, he knew exactly what he was doing, and didn't

door and peered inside her home window.

And of course, those discrete acts of interstate stalking were part of a much larger conspiracy to engage in interstate stalking. We've already gone over the evidence of the invasive surveillance of the victims that Zhu Yong and Chinese officials commissioned to McMahon beginning in 2016. We've already gone over the forced visit of Xu Jin's father in April 2017 from China to New Jersey. We've gone over McMahon's surveillance of Xu Jin that followed. And we've gone over the threatening note that Congying Zheng left at the Xu family home.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You also heard about the harassment of Sabrina Xu,

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1 Xu Jin and Liu Fang's daughter, on Facebook, and you heard

about the series of mailings with letters and videos that Liu

3 Yan, Xu Jin's sister-in-law, received at her home in 2018.

There is a clear escalation over time in the harassment

5 campaign.

Every defendant sitting at that table actively participated in that harassment campaign. The interstate stalking campaign traumatized the victims, traumatized their families. Liu Yan, Xu Jin's sister-in-law, told you that she had no proper words to describe the mental pain we have suffered.

And then she told you: My sister, my older sister was almost collapse, on the verge of collapsing. She could not eat, could not sleep, and getting thinner and thinner. Yeah, I was scared that she would not be able to take it anymore. She's distant away from all the Chinese people and friends from who -- who are from China. She distance or disconnected himself with family.

That's transcript page 126.

And Liu Fang herself described how her life was turned upside down, 180 degrees, overnight. That's transcript pages 732 and 33.

And then you heard Liu Fang describe how she told her daughter to send her an emoji every day just to let her know that she was safe: I am also very concerned about the

Summation - Ms. Arfa

safety of my daughter, she told you. Therefore, I ask my daughter from then on to send me a message every day, no matter how busy she was, even though an emoji would do, just to say that she's safe. That's transcript page 730.

We have proven Count Three, conspiracy to engage in interstate stalking, with respect to all three defendants.

Let's look now at the charges that the defendants were acting as illegal foreign agents. Again, I'm going to begin with Count Two, which is the count that they acted as illegal foreign agents, and then I'll go back to the conspiracy count, which is Count One.

I expect that Judge Chen will instruct you that the elements of Count Two are:

First: The defendant acted as an agent of the Chinese Government or a Chinese Government official.

Second: The defendant failed to notify the Attorney General that he would be doing so.

Third: The defendant acted knowingly.

Fourth: The defendant acted, at least in part, in the United States.

I also expect that Judge Chen will instruct you that an agreement to act as an illegal agent does not need to be a formal or contractual agreement. The agent doesn't have to receive payment or compensation. A mutual understanding is sufficient.

I also expect that Judge Chen will instruct you that agreeing to act at the direction of a foreign government does not require that the agent or the defendant is essentially acting as an employee of the foreign government. You can act under the direction of a foreign government in a more hands-off way and still be acting as an agent.

With respect to Count One, I expect Judge Chen will instruct you that the elements are:

First: There was an agreement to act at the direction of the Chinese Government without notifying the Attorney General.

Second: The defendant knowingly and intentionally became a member of that agreement.

Third: An overt act was committed in furtherance of that agreement.

Similarly to the charge that defendants conspired to commit interstate stalking, here, to find the defendants guilty of Count One, you do not need to find that anyone even acted at the direction of the Chinese Government. As I explained earlier, it's the agreement that is the crime here.

Let's discuss the evidence relating to Count Two.

There's no dispute that the overarching campaign to harass and intimidate Xu Jin and Liu Fang, the victims, was directed by the Chinese Government. The officials of the Chinese Government involved in that harassment campaign --

Summation - Ms. Arfa

Xu Jin in September 2018, telling him that if he served 10 years in a Chinese prison, his wife and children would be okay.

I expect Judge Chen will instruct you that if the evidence proves that any of the defendants acted at the direction of the Chinese Government for any period of time between September 2016 and December 2019, then you must find them guilty of Count Two. In other words, you do not need to find that the defendant was an agent during the entire period charged in the indictment.

The first element of Count Two is proven.

With respect to the second element, there's no dispute that none of the defendants notified the Attorney General. In fact, the parties have stipulated to that. That means all the parties agree that's true and that's in evidence.

There's also no dispute that the defendants acted, at least in part, within the United States. The surveillance, the harassment, the intimidation, that occurred in New Jersey and it occurred in New York. The only real issue in dispute for this count is whether the defendants knew they were working for the Chinese Government, whether they knew they were acting at the direction of the Chinese Government, and whether the defendants agreed to do it. And the evidence has shown that each of the defendants knew exactly who they were

Summation - Ms. Arfa

working for. They knew they were working for the Chinese Government.

Let's begin with Zhu Yong. You've seen a lot of evidence that Zhu Yong was acting at the direction of the Chinese Government. We've talked about much of that evidence already, and I'm not going to go through it in detail again, so let me just summarize it.

In September 2016, while he was in China, Zhu Yong arranged for McMahon to be hired. Zhu Yong signed a retainer agreement. Zhu Yong made the initial payment to McMahon with a check, with a memo line that specifically says: Retainer fee from, paid by Jason Zhu a/k/a Yong Zhu, meaning Zhu Yong. Zhu Yong provided McMahon with incredibly sensitive information about the victims, as we've seen. Zhu Yong then received regular updates with McMahon's findings. Zhu Yong went to the meeting at the Panera Bread with McMahon and Hu Ji, the Chinese police officer.

Later on, after McMahon obtained Xu Jin's address, it was Zhu Yong who conducted additional surveillance at the home of Xu Jin's sister-in-law, Liu Fang, and he did that just days before he returned to China.

Rather than going through that evidence again, let me focus on the evidence that Zhu Yong knew he was working for the Chinese Government.

As early as August 2016, Zhu Yong was working for

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1 (Continuing.)

MS. ARFA: Zhu Yong was listed as the middleman because that's exactly what he was; he was a middleman between Michael McMahon and the Chinese government.

When Zhu Yong first hired McMahon, Zhu Yong told the translator that he, meaning Zhu Yong, was looking for Xu Jin, Zhu Yong said, because Xu Jin owed him money. You can see that in GX 3011. This is an e-mail from the translator saying: Jin Xu is a gentlemen who owed -- that's a typo, but owed a lot of money for Mr. Jason Zhu. That was a lie and Zhu Yong obviously knew it was a lie. He knew that Xu Jin didn't owe him money. He knew that the Chinese government was hunting down Xu Jin in an effort to force him back to China.

And in following weeks, Zhu Yong provided this highly sensitive information about a victim to McMahon, including Exit & Entry Permit records for Hong Kong and Macao, Chinese I.D. numbers and Chinese family travel information.

That's information that could only have been gotten by the Chinese government. "From." I should say "from" the Chinese government.

And Zhu Yong obviously knew that the information was coming from the Chinese government, given his repeated contacts with Chinese government officials. So you saw a few moments ago his e-mail with Sun Hui, which was in September 2016. He also spoke regularly or frequently with

Summation - Ms. Arfa

Hu Ji, the Chinese police officer, in the days leading up to
the meeting in October 2016 at the Panera Bread. And again,
that was the meeting between Zhu Yong, Hu Ji and Michael

McMahon. So you can see here that in the days leading up to
that meeting, he was talking frequently to Hu Ji.

But Zhu Yong did more than just act as an intermediary and he did more than just hire Michael McMahon. In May 2018, long after Xu Jin had already been located, Zhu Yong conducted additional surveillance. He took photos of Liu Fang's sister's home and he took photos of her vehicle. These are the surveillance photos he took. And then four days after getting those surveillance photos, he returned to China. We know that from his travel records.

Zhu Yong knew exactly what was going on. He knew it was the Chinese government who was looking for Xu Jin. He knew that it was the Chinese government officials that he was working for. His very own words confirmed that. He was asked: Mr. Hu and the young man, they were here to do what about in fugitive? He responded: Look for that person.

Mr. Hu there is Hu Ji, the Chinese police officer. That's an admission that he knew that Hu Ji was in the United States looking for Xu Jin, the alleged fugitive. And a few minutes later when Zhu Yong was asked: So is Hu Ji part of the police? He responded: I don't know, but he's part of the unit he mentioned before, the overseas, Overseas Chinese

1 Affairs Office. He's part of that.

The Overseas Chinese Affairs Office is a Chinese government entity. You heard that from Professor Wedeman.

And you can see it here in the party-state system chart that Professor Wedeman used to explain the structure of the Chinese government. It's not a secret that the Overseas Chinese Affairs department is a government entity. And the Overseas Chinese Affairs Office isn't just any government entity, it's one with a known and specific role in Operation FOX HUNT. As Professor Wedeman told you, its role with respect to Operation FOX HUNT is helping the other agencies locate and repatriate individuals to China. Zhu Yong knew that's who Hu Ji was working for.

Zhu Yong later admitted again that he knew that the Chinese government was looking for Xu Jin. He said: Police are looking for him.

And then Xu Jin -- I'm sorry.

And then Zhu Yong described how the Overseas Chinese Affairs Office was only one of the many departments in the Chinese government trying to find Xu Jin. He said: There are several departments looking for him. Whoever finds him first, you know, gets an award. Several departments. All departments are all, like, applied to look for this person. This person is Xu Jin and these departments are the departments in the Chinese government.

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1974

1 Let's go back to Professor Wedeman's chart again. 2 You can look at all of the different departments involved in 3 Operation FOX HUNT, ones other than the Overseas Chinese 4 Affairs department: United Front Work Department, Central 5 Committee for Discipline Inspection, the Anticorruption 6 Bureau. Zhu Yong, during his post-arrest interview, 7 essentially outlined the structure of the Chinese government 8 when it comes to Operation FOX HUNT. He knew exactly who he 9 was working for. He knew he was working for the Chinese 10 government. And he knew that when he hired McMahon and when he helped Hu Ji track down Xu Jin. 11 12 This count is proven with respect to Zhu Yong. 13 Let's turn now to Michael McMahon. 14 The evidence that Michael McMahon knew he was 15 working for the Chinese government and that the goal was to 16 force Xu Jin to return to China is overwhelming. I won't go 17 through all of that, but I will summarize some of the 18 highlights. I'm going to talk about each of these in a little 19 bit more detail. So first, McMahon was given -- McMahon's clients 20 kept changing. 21 22 So let's start with what he was told when he was 23 hired. The information he was given kept changing without 24 explanation. You can look at the summary chart. On September 25 27, 2017, he was told in an e-mail that the client was a,

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1975

quote, "lady who had been through a lot." On October 5th,
2016, he was told that it was Mr. Jason Zhu; "Mister," not a
lady. November 13, 2016; client was referenced as "Eric Yan."
April 4, 2016, client was referenced as "Eric's friend from
China" or "Johnny," meaning Zhu Feng. Four different supposed
clients, at least.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That should have been a red flag to anybody and certainly to a private investigator with McMahon's lengthy law enforcement history. Not just a red flag, but it was a lie. And it was a lie that McMahon, again, the better investigator, caught almost immediately because the same day he received an e-mail from the translator saying that Xu Jin was a gentleman who owed a lot of money to Jason Zhu. That was the e-mail we looked at earlier in which Zhu Yong lied. The same day Michael McMahon received that e-mail, he conducted his own search and he learned that Xu Jin was wanted by the Chinese government. We know that. And we know that McMahon immediately understood the significance of that information because he sent it to his friend, Private Investigator Gallowitz. This is an e-mail that McMahon sends to Gallowitz. The subject line: TLO report says wanted by Interpol. TLO report, you heard, was the database from which you learned that Xu Jin was wanted by Interpol.

McMahon also sent himself the China Daily article that you heard a lot about. The title of this article is

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1 "Interpol Launches Global Dragnet for 100 Chinese Fugitives."

2 That article included photos and information about both Xu Jin

3 and Lui Fang. That's GX 4018 and GX 4019-B. McMahon sent

4 himself the link in April 2017 with the subject line "China

most wanted." But by that point he already knew.

McMahon also collected information that was completely irrelevant to collecting a debt, which is supposedly why he had been hired, or even to conducting surveillance. For example, he looked for information about whether Xu Jin and Lui Fang's college-aged daughter was -- where she was in college and what her major was. Her major, that's not information needed to collect a debt. That's information collected as part of a harassment campaign.

McMahon also improperly accessed and misused information he obtained from the New Jersey Motor Vehicle Commission, which you heard is also referred to as New Jersey CAIR. While conducting the surveillance, McMahon took a photo of a vehicle and he zoomed in on the license plate, as you can see on this exhibit. He believed it belonged to Xu Jin and he then sent it on to Johnny Zhu. Johnny Zhu, you can see in this text exchange, asks him: MC, meaning McMahon, please run info check or plate and the house ASAP. We don't need to monitor their activity until we have some info for those. That's April 6, 2017. McMahon responds "okay." And then he sends information. He sends information about the car being

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1977

owned, not leased, and who it's owned by, and their home address.

To pause on that, that's information that McMahon obtained and then passed along to someone who was working for the Chinese government. That's information that McMahon had access to because he could access the database as a private investigator. But as you heard, he wasn't allowed to access that database for just any reason; he was bound by an agreement which specifically limited how he could use the information he obtained. When McMahon shared the information with Johnny Zhu, he violated that agreement. The purpose for which he shared the information, conducting surveillance and locating an individual for reasons not relating to motor vehicle activity is exactly what he is not allowed to do. can see that from the language of the agreement itself. It says the information shall be -- that the participant, meaning McMahon, must hold the information in confidence. And it says that he is strictly prohibited from using Commission records to conduct surveillance or to investigate or locate an individual.

From the evidence you have heard, you can infer that McMahon improperly obtained the information about Xu Jin and Liu Fang from his buddy, Greg Finning, who at the time was a special agent with the Drug Enforcement Administration or DEA. October 20th, 2016, McMahon spoke with Greg for over

Summation - Ms. Arfa

40 minutes. You can see that in this phone record. He also sent a text to Greg with sensitive victim information, including social security number, date of birth, New Jersey license plate. That's GX 316 4006-B. And then he followed up with Greg to ask if there was any update. He said: My clients flew in from China and I'm meeting them this eve.

DHS records make clear that Homeland Security data such as the information that was provided cannot be shared. This is a warning on the documents in which the information was provided. It says: The information is to be controlled, stored, handled, transmitted, distributed and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to FOUO -- meaning "for official use only," as you can see on the warning itself -- information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid need to know without prior approval of an authorized DHS official.

Let's go back and see how we got that information. You heard testimony from HSI Special Agent Neviene Habeeb, who is the individual who pulled the information that McMahon eventually passed along. She told you that she remembered it had something to do with Greg Finning. That was McMahon's friend. And so to be clear, McMahon took U.S. government information which he obtained improperly and he passed it along to an official with the Chinese government.

That's not the only evidence reflecting that McMahon

Summation - Ms. Arfa

knew his actions relating to Xu Jin were illegal. Let's look at the payments he received.

Oh, I'm sorry, before I do that, this is the e-mail passing along the information from Special Agent Habeeb, who is the one who told you that her recollection was that the request came from Greg Finning.

So, let's look at McMahon's payments in connection with what I'll call "the Xu Jin case."

On October 5th, 2016, at the outset of the case, McMahon received \$5,000. That was a retainer fee. You can see there is a note that says: Retainer fee from Jason Zhu, a/k/a Yong Zhu. That's the check we talked about earlier. And that was a check from Zhu Yong, passed along to the interpreter and then sent to McMahon, who then deposited that check into his business account, McMahon Investigative Group account. Again, that was October 5th, 2016.

Approximately two months later, on December 13, 2016, he received \$5,945. That came by wire transfer from China. He was told to expect that wire transfer by Hu Ji, the Chinese police officer. And the wire transfer itself came from Li Feng, a Chinese prosecutor. Again, it was a wire transfer from China and McMahon knew it was from China. And he knew the description on that wire transfer, "Eric traveling fee," wasn't accurate. And then look at what he did with that wire transfer. He took that almost \$6,000 and he deposited it

Summation - Ms. Arfa

into his checking account with his wife. He did not deposit it into his business account like he did the first payment.

The next payment is April 4th, 2017. That's \$5,000. This time there was a payment made in cash. McMahon got it from Hu Ji and from Johnny Zhu when he met them at the Panera Bread. \$5,000 in cash at a Panera Bread. That's a lot of money to be receiving in cash in a public place or really in any place. No person doing legitimate business is handed a five-thousand-dollar wad of cash in a Panera Bread, it doesn't happen. Oh, I'm sorry, I misspoke. That was Zhu Feng, not Hu Ji for this payment. And we don't know what happened with that cash. We don't know what McMahon did with it, but we do know that it didn't go into the business account.

On April 10th, 2017, there is another payment of \$2,000, also from Zhu Feng or Johnny Zhu. This time it was deposited into his son's student checking account. The following day, he gets a payment of another thousand dollars, which again from the same, also from Johnny Zhu, which he again deposits into his son's student checking account.

McMahon subsequently, a couple weeks later, transferred that \$3,000 -- so the \$2,000 from April 10, 2017 and the \$1,000 from April 11, 2017 -- transferred that \$3,000 total to pay off a credit card with his wife.

And then on April 27, 2017, he gets a payment of \$200, this time from Hu Ji, using the name He Sheng, which

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1 McMahon deposits into the checking account with his wife.

So for this one case, McMahon received payments from four different sources, including two Chinese government officials and two coconspirators, one of whom is the defendant before you. He received the payment in three different formats: Check, wire transfer, cash. And that wire transfer again was from China. And he deposited those payments in at least three different accounts: His business account, his checking account with his wife, and his son's student checking account.

And let's look at the timing of what he did and when he did it. It's no coincidence that the only time he deposited the payment from the Xu Jin case into his business account was — that it was before he learned Xu Jin was wanted. As soon as McMahon learned that Xu Jin was wanted by the Chinese government, he switched to depositing his payments into the other accounts, his joint account with his wife and his son's student account. That's not a matter of convenience. McMahon was deliberately concealing those payments. He was deliberately concealing those sources because he knew the work he was doing was illegal. He knew the payments he was receiving were illegal. He knew the payments were coming from the Chinese government. You can go back and look at those at GX 403-A through L, 436-A, 3072 to '73 and 3075.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1982

And that's not even the only way that McMahon's financials demonstrate that he knew he was working for the Chinese government. He earned over \$19,000 from the Xu Jin case. There is -- you can see that at the bottom of this graphic which shows you the different amounts he received and the methods by which he received them. Again, the check, the wire transfer, and the cash, as well as the different sources from which he received this information and the different descriptions.

And then you can see from this slide how he treated that money, or I should say more broadly, what he reported on his tax returns. There's a lot of information on this slide, but really what it boils down to is this: If you look at McMahon's business account, the deposits into that account in 2016 were more than what he reported on his 2016 tax returns. That's before you even consider the fact that, as we just saw, most of the money he earned on the Xu Jin case never even made its way into the business account. Again, this wasn't oversight. And it wasn't some small amount of money to McMahon. In fact, the money McMahon earned in this case was approximately 20 percent of his total reported earnings in his business account for 2016 and 2017 combined. McMahon didn't report his earnings from the Xu Jin case because he didn't want the U.S. government to know that he had been working for the Chinese government.

Summation - Ms. Arfa

And for even further proof that McMahon knew exactly what he was doing, we can look at his very own words. In his post-arrest interview, he said: And then the father had flown in from, I think he said, China to convince the son because of -- you know, out of honor for the name. Professor Wedeman explained to you the significance of family honor in Chinese culture. He told you that by approaching the family and by potentially pressuring the family, you are signalling to the individual that they are putting -- they are -- their refusal or lack of return to China is putting the family in danger. McMahon's post-arrest statement reflects that he understood that.

So that's been a lot of information about McMahon and what he knew, so let me take a moment to summarize. From the evidence you have seen, you can infer the following:

Back on April 3rd, 2017, there was a meeting with Tu Lan and Zhu Feng. That meeting, Tu Lan -- again, the Chinese prosecutor tasked with bringing Xu Jin back to China -- specifically said, talking about McMahon: Tell him clearly. I mean, you need to tell him clearly about everything. That's GX 704-A.

April 4th, 2017 is the meeting at Panera Bread that you've heard about. You can see from these surveillance photos that the meeting lasted almost an hour. That was the day after the hotel meeting at which Tu Lan instructed that

Summation - Ms. Arfa

1 McMahon should be told clearly about everything.

And then the following day, April 5th, 2017, Zhu Jin's father arrived in the United States. This is a text message from Zhu Feng to McMahon saying: I just got the package. That's a reference to Xu Jin's father. It's a coded word in a text exchange that McMahon never questioned or sought to clarify because he didn't need to; he had already been told exactly what that meant. That's GX 4010.

After his arrest, McMahon said: I think he had mentioned to me that they were trying to get him to come back to China. The "him" there is Xu Jin. And then McMahon said: So they could prosecute him. In other words, Tu Lan said that Zhu Feng should tell McMahon everything. And the evidence demonstrates that's exactly what they did. They told McMahon everything. They told him exactly who he was working for: The Chinese government. And they told him why he had been hired: To help force Xu Jin to return to China. McMahon's own words support that.

Count Two is proven.

Let's talk now about Congying Zheng. There's an additional instruction that I expect Judge Chen will provide that is particularly relevant to your consideration of the evidence against Congying Zheng: Conscious avoidance. As you will learn from Judge Chen, conscious avoidance means purposefully closing your eyes so that you don't see

Summation - Ms. Arfa

something. If Zheng was asked any questions or used his common sense, it would have been obvious to him that he was acting as an agent of the Chinese government. Nothing happens in a vacuum.

When Zheng Congying receives -- I'm sorry. When Congying Zheng received his marching orders to threaten Xu Jin at his home, he did it against the backdrop of Operation FOX HUNT, which you've heard a lot about. Operation FOX HUNT was highly publicized both on Chinese media and U.S. media during the relevant time period. You heard Vincent Kuang tell you exactly that: "Do you know if Zheng used the Chinese TikTok you were just discussing?" "Yes."

As I described earlier, there's no real question that Zheng went to Xu Jin's and Liu Fang's home to intimidate them. He invaded their private property. He banged on their door. He tried to open the front door to go inside. He went on to the back of the house. He peered inside the house. And then he left three notes, all with the exact same message, to be sure that that terrifying message wouldn't be missed. You saw and you heard a lot of evidence making absolutely clear that's what happened. These images you're looking at of Zheng doing exactly that are GX 709-A and GX 108.

You also heard testimony that Zheng was aware that others had been to the same home, Xu Jin and Liu Fang's home. That's further evidence that Zheng knew he was part of a

Defendant Zhu Yong acted as a conduit for the Chinese Government here in the United States. The evidence has shown that he repeatedly met with an official of the Chinese Government, a policeman, Hu Ji, tasked with bringing Xu Jin and Liu Fang back to China. The evidence has shown that

22

23

24

25

SUMMATION - MS. ARFA

Zhu Yong hired a private investigator to locate and surveil the victims. The evidence has shown that the private investigator that Zhu Yong hired was Defendant Michael McMahon, and the evidence has shown that months later, Zhu Yong conducted further surveillance, even after Xu Jin's home, residence, had been located and identified, and that Zhu Yong conducted that additional surveillance for days before he returned to China.

The evidence has shown that Defendant Zhu Yong knew

exactly who he was working for and what the goal was. The evidence has shown that Defendant Michael McMahon surveilled the victims. The evidence has shown that even after he obtained Xu Jin's address, McMahon continued to obtain and share detailed personal information about the victims and their family members. The evidence has shown that McMahon had no legitimate reason to obtain or share that information. The evidence has shown that his true purpose was to help the Chinese Government to harass and stalk the victims. And the evidence has shown that McMahon knew that Xu Jin and Liu Fang were wanted by the Chinese Government.

The evidence has shown that Michael McMahon knew exactly who he was working for and what the goal was. The evidence has shown that Defendant Congying Zheng went to Xu Jin and Liu Fang's home to try to find them and to leave the threatening notes on their door. The evidence has shown

| Case 1 | L:21-cr-00265-PKC Document 302 Filed 08/30/24 Page 58 of 219 PageID #: 4984 |
|--------|---|
|        | SUMMATION - MR. LUSTERBERG 1990   |
| 1      | Off the record for one second.  |
| 2      | (Off the record.)   |
| 3      | (A recess was taken.)   |
| 4      | THE COURT: My apologies, everybody. Let's get                               |
| 5      | started.  |
| 6      | Mr. Lusterberg, are you ready?  |
| 7      | MR. LUSTERBERG: Yes, Your Honor.  |
| 8      | THE COURT: Have a seat, everyone.   |
| 9      | Just off the record for a second.   |
| 10     | (Off the record.)   |
| 11     | THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.   |
| 12     | (Jury enters the courtroom.)  |
| 13     | THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone.                                      |
| 14     | Mr. Lusterberg.   |
| 15     | MR. LUSTERBERG: Thank you, Your Honor.                                      |
| 16     | THE COURT: Mr. Lusterberg, before you begin, I just                         |
| 17     | want to advise the jury that we are going to take our normal                |
| 18     | lunch break at 1:00, and I've advised Mr. Lusterberg of that.               |
| 19     | It may be that he will have to begin now before the lunch                   |
| 20     | break, but continue afterwards.   |
| 21     | Go ahead, Mr. Lusterberg.   |
| 22     | MR. LUSTERBERG: Thank you very much, Your Honor.                            |
| 23     | Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the jury.                             |
| 24     | THE JURY: Good morning (unanimously).                                       |
| 25     | MR. LUSTERBERG: And really glad to be addressing                            |

SUMMATION - MR. LUSTERBERG

1991

1 you again, although, I'm in kind of a difficult spot here. 2 Psychologists say that what people remember and process most is they call it the primacy recency phenomenon, what they hear 3 4 first, and what they hear last. Well, I'm neither first nor 5 last. You heard Ms. Arfa at some length, Mr. Heeren is going to go at the end, and in between, you'll hear my colleagues, 6 7 Mr. Goldberger and Mr. Tung. So I have to really ask you to 8 do the best that you can, and I know that you will, to focus 9 on what I say, to try to remember it, and to consider it when 10 it comes time for you to do your deliberations. I know you'll do that. 11 12 But I know it's also difficult, and all I can do is 13 really plead for you, because I'm in this difficult position 14 with my client, Mike McMahon's very life on the line. So I 15 just have to plead with you to just do the best you can to

think of all of what I'm going to say, to consider all of it as you deliberate.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When I stood up at the beginning of this case, I told you that a lot of the facts of the case with regard to Mike McMahon would be undisputed, and really, that's turned out to be true. Let's start here: We have never denied, never for one second, that Mr. McMahon was hired to be a private investigator, which, by the way, you've heard is a legitimate profession, you've heard from other private investigators, you've heard from the New Jersey Motor Vehicle

SUMMATION - MR. LUSTERBERG

Commission saying they provide records to private
investigators, and that he was hired to be a private
investigator for an investigation that involved Mr. Zhu --

Xu Jin.

There's also no doubt as to how he got hired. That story has been told here. Yong Zhu sought to hire someone to assist him to collect a debt, he went to a Chinese-speaking attorney, Liping Shi, Ms. Shi, who you heard from, looking to find a private investigator who was licensed in New Jersey.

Ms. Shi, in turn, reached out to an attorney that she knew from the Kings County courthouse, I think she said, where she did a little bit of criminal work. She was mainly an immigration lawyer. That attorney, in turn, contacted Paul Brickfield, from whom you've heard, a former and a criminal defense attorney in New Jersey asking for a recommendation as to an investigator.

Paul recommended Mike McMahon, a former NYC cop and a private investigator who lived and worked in New Jersey.

Mike got to work. Let's be clear about this, not because he had some kind of history for working for the Chinese

Government or because he was some sort of great candidate to break the law. He got the work because he was an investigator in New Jersey to whom the case was referred. He did a normal written retainer agreement which we'll show you, and was shown to you earlier. There it is, Exhibit 3009. I know that's a

of them was a woman.

Any event, having been properly retained, he now, seven years later, finds himself in front of you, members of the jury, accused of four federal offenses. It's almost really unimaginable.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's also very little doubt, actually, as to what Mr. McMahon did. He performed surveillance on five days, five days, over six months apart. One date in October of 2016. That was October 6th, 2016. And sorry, when I refer to notes, there's, like, a lot of facts, so I want to make sure I get them right. And four days in 2017; April 5th, April 6th, April 10th, and April 11th, at both Xu Jin's sister-in-law's home in Short Hills, New Jersey, and at his own home in Warren, New Jersey. So that, ladies and gentlemen, is what this case is about, five days in the life which the Government has pulled apart, dissected, and searched for reasons to condemn. I'll come back to that.

trying to help collect a debt. I want to show you a couple of exhibits about that.

So Exhibit 3026.

23

24

25

And here, if you take a look it -- I don't know if

Let's look, as well, at Exhibit 3056 at Page 3.

Again, I'm sorry for the small print. I know it's hard to see.

And what it says is, Sorry for misunderstanding of offshore. From the financial record of our company -- and I should note, this is an e-mail from Eric Yan. I'll come back to Mr. Yan in a minute.

Sorry for misunderstanding of offshore. From the financial record of our company, Zhu transferred the money to those eight accounts, so we need check these accounts first. Several accounts are from United States.

Why am I telling you this? I'm telling you this to show that what Mr. McMahon was investigating was the assets of someone who he had been told was -- had embezzled money and he was trying to recover that money.

There isn't any question, though, and we have never denied either, that Jin Zhu was wanted in China, or even that those who hired Mike were Chinese officials who were involved in an operation to repatriate him. That's not something that

SUMMATION - MR. LUSTERBERG

1996

we've disputed. There is -- I'll come back to that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But there's not even any real doubt that he met some of those people, and the Government, you saw, a lot of video at Panera Bread and so forth, at Panera Bread twice, and once, you saw some reference to meeting at a lawyer's office. Much ado, in fact, has been made of the picture of Mike at Panera Bread -- let's just remind you of that picture, Exhibit 902F, you saw it again today -- as if it were really some evidence of criminality. I want to think about that picture as you deliberate, that this, the Government says, is evidence of a crime, a man standing in a public place at Panera Bread with two other people. Mike has never denied that meeting took place any more than the Government has never denied that Mike had no intersection whatsoever with many of the people that you saw on the chart earlier. People like Tu Lan, Xiao Jun, Sun Hui, Li Minjun, Li Feng. Those are names that you heard over and over, and you saw them on the chart in front of you for most of this trial. There is no contention by the Government and it is undisputed that Mike McMahon never interacted, never met, never talked to, never corresponded with, with one exception I'll get to in a second, any of them. And the one exception is Li Feng, which I'll come to. Also, you saw from the cell site data that he was

never where near the Embassy Suites near Newark Airport where there was a meeting that you heard a lot about, and we'll come

SUMMATION - MR. LUSTERBERG

back to that, where this whole surveillance operation was discussed. All of those sorts of things here, ladies and gentlemen, are really undisputed. You don't have difficult fact-findings to find about who Mike McMahon was and what he was doing.

What is disputed, and it's important to listen to what everybody says and remember that this is what's disputed, is Mike's understanding that in doing the work he was, he was working, not for China, but for a company seeking to recover the proceeds of an embezzlement which is what he understood. The -- it was not -- the evidence, you know, what's disputed, is whether he was involved in a -- not in an effort to get Mr. Zhu to return to China, but whether he was trying to do that on behalf of the Chinese Government. And Ms. Arfa has argued that he was, and I'm going to show you why he wasn't.

Let me start here: There is not one, as I told you, there would not be, not one spec of evidence of direct evidence that Mike McMahon knew he was working for China.

Now, you've heard a lot about circumstantial evidence, about putting money in his son's account, about taxes, about getting records, but think to yourself, isn't it true what I told you in openings that there was not one piece of evidence, not one e-mail, where Mike is told that he's working for China or reflects that he understands he's working for China, not one text message, where he says, I know I'm working for China or

SUMMATION - MR. LUSTERBERG

someone informs him that he's working for China, not one witness who reports a conversation, not one who reports saying, I spoke to Mike McMahon and I told him he was working for China. Not one witness sat on that witness stand and said something like that to you. Not one statement by Mike McMahon that said I know I'm working for China. Not one. That lack of evidence alone creates reasonable doubt as to whether Mike knew that he was working for China.

But leave aside for the moment what the Government didn't prove, though there was lots of that. You saw over and over, over and over, that there was no evidence of the conversations that Mike was having with people. I want really to focus on this just for a moment, if I can. Ms. Arfa argued to you a few minutes ago that there were meetings that Mr. McMahon had where he talked with people about working for China. But think to yourself whether you heard anything about that. The answer is no. In fact, what you heard over and over was that the Government didn't know what occurred in all the conversations that took place between Mr. McMahon and others.

Let me just remind you of one Exhibit first. So remember Exhibit 316 -- and you could look, as well, at Government Exhibit 317. These are -- these reflect calls that were made between Mr. McMahon and other people, and on cross-examination, we asked the agent, I think it was, who was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUMMATION - MR. LUSTERBERG

1999

presenting this information, do you have any information about what was said in those calls, anything at all, and the answer, of course, was no. And when the expert, Ms. Wheeler, Agent Wheeler, on cell site data came up, she talked about a lot of calls too. And Ms. Conti, questioned her, do you know, do you have any information about what the content of those calls was, and the answer to that was no. Because we don't know what those calls was. There was no one witness who came forward and said what was said to Mr. McMahon or by Mr. McMahon on those calls. But it's more than that. Remember the second meeting in April of 2017 at Panera Bread. That was a meeting between Mr. McMahon and Johnny Zhu between coming and going in the Panera Bread, Ms. Arfa is right, it's about an hour. what was said during that hour? No one knows. No one can know. Johnny Zhu was present for that meeting with Mr. McMahon, wasn't here to testify. We'll come back to that. And the other person who was present at that meeting Hongru Jin specifically testified, and you heard him, he said he sat off to the side and couldn't hear a word of the

Hongru Jin specifically testified, and you heard him, he said he sat off to the side and couldn't hear a word of the conversation. So Ms. Arfa says to you today that they must have talked, in essence, about China, because this occurred a day after a meeting -- which we'll come back to -- at the Embassy Suites, in which Tu Lan directed Johnny Zhu to tell everything to Mr. McMahon -- but we'll come back to that --

SUMMATION - MR. LUSTERBERG

and because it was an hour, basically. So -- oh, and she also says that there was an e-mail later that used the word package which she said was code for something. But that you heard no evidence about package being a code for everything. Nobody testified to you about that. And I'm going to, again, beseech you, just consider the actual evidence, not stuff that's made up, based upon the evidence.

Any way, let's talk a little bit -- and let me say one other thing about that. Our whole system turns on your considering -- and Judge Chen will instruct you as to the law, and I'll say the same thing as Ms. Arfa did, anything I say about it that's inconsistent with what she says, she wins -- you have to consider the evidence. The whole system is built on considering what was actually introduced, not what the Government thinks was introduced.

But let me show you some things that were introduced. Texts and e-mails in which from the very beginning, Mike McMahon was told over and over and, in no uncertain terms, that he was trying to find a McMahon who had stolen money. Remember -- let's start here -- this e-mail in response to Mike's effort to understand what was going on. So first, Mr. McMahon asks some questions. The Government says Mr. McMahon asked no questions. He asked some questions about what the Investigation was about. That's Exhibit 1022. And the response from the translator at the time -- and Ms. Arfa

SUMMATION - MR. LUSTERBERG 2001 1 showed you this as well, that's still 1022 -- says, Sorry 2 Mike, I forgot to indicate Jin Xu's gender. Jin Xu is a 3 gentleman who owned -- owed -- a lot of money for 4 Mr. Jason Zhu. Instead of repaying the money he owned, Mr. Xu 5 chose to run away and that's why Mr. Zhu needs to find out where does Jin Xu live and other relate information. Mr. Zhu 6 7 said there's no attorneys involved -- answering one of the 8 questions that Mr. McMahon had asked. 9 Gives you a sense of what he was looking at. 10 let's talk about this in a little more detail, because you heard a lot more than that. And I'd ask you to remember all 11 12 of those texts that were read to you in which over and over, 13 Mike was told, in no uncertain terms, by Zhu Feng -- that's 14 Johnny Zhu -- that he was working for a company, for a 15 company. There are a lot of these, and you'll have all of

them in front of you. But I'm going to remind you of the

evidence by showing you just a few.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So let's look first at exhibit -- Government Exhibit 805B at Page 13. So this is text exchange between Mr. McMahon and Johnny Zhu in which Johnny Zhu says, okay, MC, I spoke with my company last night, they want you to monitor on Monday, but with one person. Meaning, one other investigator with him. Or just him. I haven't get reply from invoice yet. I think they are okay with it. Can you start on Monday first and I will come to your office by Tuesday.

pictures and explained who all of those people were and who

25

references a company.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let's look at Government Exhibit 3047 in evidence.

This is an email between Eric Yan and Mike, in which Eric says: I have already back to China and reported all we found to my boss of the company. And then he later says: So we are willing to commission you to start the offshore property investigation and also the investigation of these eight account.

Then, and this is important, Exhibit 3056, this was on December 4, 2016. This is an email from Eric Yan, the alias, to Mike, which says: Hi, Mike. Our finance manager wire you the money this morning. It will take three to five working days to get to your account.

This is important because, if we look -- we looked earlier at the exhibit that said: Sorry for the misunderstanding. From the financial record of our company,

Summation - Mr. Lustberg

Zhu transferred the money to those eight account, so we need to check those accounts first.

So this is part of that same inquiry into Mr. Zhu's assets.

But approximately three to five working days later, and this is Government Exhibit 403-A that you have there, Mr. McMahon gets a wire transfer from Li Feng. Now, you know, but there's no evidence that Mr. McMahon knew that Li Feng was also a government official in China. What he understood, would have understood, reasonably you can infer based upon these emails, is that Li Feng was the finance manager who had been referred to as wiring him money that would take three to five days to clear, and that's exactly what happened.

Let's step back from all of this, and let me ask you to just really use your common sense. If Mike McMahon was in this conspiracy, if he had reached an agreement with these people to act on behalf of China, why would they be leading him to believe that he was working for a company? You know the answer; you do. Because you heard the testimony of Hongru Jin who last week told you, after having listened to a tape-recording of a meeting between him and Tu Lan and Johnny Zhu, a meeting at the Embassy Suites, to which Mike McMahon was not invited and certainly was not present, as the cell site data showed, and this is what -- on pages 1088 and 1089 of the transcript, and I didn't put it up, but let me remind

But I asked Hongru Jin: Do you know whether Mike McMahon was, quote/unquote, told everything? Do you know, I asked him, what Johnny Zhu said to the private investigator?

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Lustberg

To which Hongru Jin, who was present for the meeting the next day at the Panera Bread, said: Sorry, I don't know.

And I said: Okay. Because you never spoke to

Johnny Zhu about what he said to the private investigator; is
that correct?

He said: Yes. It was because when Johnny Zhu was talking to the private investigator, at the time I was staying at another table, there was some distance, so I don't know what was discussed.

Hongru Jin, the witness that they put up there to make this case about what Mr. McMahon knew, didn't hear anything. And Johnny Zhu, as you saw on the videotape, was permitted to get on a plane and go back to China.

Mike McMahon was not trusted by the Chinese. And let me be clear: Among the things I don't dispute is that those people, Tu Lan, Hu Ji, that they're Chinese Government officials. I mean, I don't know, but I think the Government showed that to you. But Mike was not part of that inner circle, that inner circle that planned this operation, that sat in a room at the Embassy Suites Hotel. And why? If he was really part of the conspiracy, don't you think they would have invited him into that? But they didn't, because they didn't want him to know what they were doing.

And let's think about some of the other evidence you heard that goes to that. Hongru Jin, who was present for that

Summation - Mr. Lustberg

meeting and was part of this whole kind of inner circle in a way, he got specific direction about what to do in case he was caught. Remember that? He was told, in case you're caught, tell a story, say that you're a tour guide. That was -- he got advice on what to do if he ever got caught.

By the way, if you remember the videotape of Johnny Zhu, Johnny obviously told the same story.

Mike McMahon wasn't given any kind of story to tell. There's no evidence of that. There's no emails about that, there's no texts about that. In fact, what you know, based upon what we've just talked about and what you've seen by way of evidence, is that the Chinese lied to Mike McMahon. They lied to him about what he was investigating, they lied to him about who he was. And you know that they're perfectly capable of that because you saw, and Ms. Arfa described it well, the videotape that was played to you, I think on Monday, where it's horribly manipulative, you know, emotionally twisted videotape trying to get the family to return to China. They're capable of that kind of deceit. And that family is a victim of Chinese misconduct.

But ladies and gentlemen, so is Mike McMahon. May be, you know, a cop for a while, he shouldn't have been, but should and shouldn't is not what this case is about. This is not a negligence case. It's a case about whether he had criminal intent. It's a case about whether he knew he was

1 working for China.

Later on today, or whenever we get to instructions, hopefully today, Judge Chen will instruct you to find a defendant guilty of this offense; that is, the offense set forth in Count Two and it's the conspiracy in Count One, you must find that the defendant knew that he was acting as an agent of the Government or an official of China. Not should have known; that he knew.

Mike McMahon didn't know, because he was deceived from the outset. He was lied to. Ladies and gentlemen, he, too, is a victim of this offense. That, respectfully, is what the evidence shows.

Anyway, the prosecutors sort of have to acknowledge that there's no direct evidence, that there's no conversation in which Mike acknowledges that he was working for China, that there's no witness who says I told Mike he was working for China. There's no emails or texts or conversations along those lines that says that he was working for the People's Republic of China.

So they have to focus on the circumstantial evidence. And I'm going to talk about their circumstantial evidence that you heard about this morning in a moment. And Judge Chen will also instruct you as to circumstantial evidence. And she'll tell you that you can consider circumstantial evidence just as you would direct evidence.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Lustberg

2012

I'm not trying to demean it. It is like -- I think I talked about this in my opening, as well. We're all here in this room with no windows, if somebody just walked in, and maybe this can even happen later today, we actually need the rain, if somebody walked in with a wet umbrella, you could infer that it was raining outside. That's is circumstantial evidence. Even though there's no direct evidence, you didn't see the rain, you didn't see the rain hitting that umbrella, you could infer that. That's what circumstantial evidence is, and that evidence can be used by you in deciding guilt or innocence in this case. Judge Chen will tell you that you should do that based upon reason, experience, and common sense to infer the existence or nonexistence of a fact from other established facts. And again, she'll put it in the right words. I'm just kind of summarizing for you here. But here, those established facts lead, like night

But here, those established facts lead, like night from day, inexorably, to the conclusion that Mike did not know that he was working as some sort of secret agent for the People's Republic of China.

So here's the circumstantial evidence to which I would point and I would ask you all to consider.

First, if Mike knew that he was illegally working for the People's Republic of China, that is, if he knew that he was breaking the law as opposed to making a terrible

Summation - Mr. Lustberg

mistake in agreeing to take this work in the first place,
would he have met with government officials in highly public
places, with surveillance cameras, like Panera Bread in
Paramus, New Jersey on two occasions or like a lawyer's

office?

Just to remind you, let's take a quick look at one of the pictures at Panera Bread. This is Government Exhibit 103-A.

And look at all those people. And there's Johnny Zhu, who is identified. And this is the place where this secret is being all discussed by people speaking in English.

So is that the kind of thing that people who are involved in some kind of secret campaign do? That's circumstantial evidence, that Mike McMahon did not know he was working for the Chinese. If he knew that he was doing something wrong, if he knew that he was working for the Chinese, would he have involved so many other people? You've seen, you know, the evidence of the calls and the texts that show that he worked with people and, in fact, he subcontracted with two other former NYC cops, Eric Gallowitz, who testified, and Mike Kelly, to help him with his surveillance and in his work to obtain records. These are people with whom he shared critical facts about the case, including the China article about how Mr. Zhu was wanted in China for embezzlement and corruption.

Summation - Mr. Lustberg

If you're doing something wrong, are you going to hire other people who are former law enforcement to work with you to do that? Maybe most powerfully, would he have told the police -- this is not something that came up in the Government's summation -- exactly what he was up to? The evidence before you will show that when Mike McMahon went and did surveillance in the towns of Short Hills and Warren, he informed the local police of that.

Let me show you the evidence of some of that, at least. This is Exhibit 407, which is a police report from Millburn, which is where Short Hills is, for those of you who don't know New Jersey. And among the things it says is, it discloses that the investigators who are there, are there, and that they're carrying; that is, that they have a gun. You heard some evidence that they were carrying weapons. Beyond that -- and you'll see reports -- I'm not going to put it up right now, but there's also Exhibit 410, which is a similar police report for Warren.

So Mike McMahon goes to these places, and he reports to the police that he's doing surveillance. Is that something he would do if he thought he was illegally working for the Chinese? Just ask yourself as you think about this evidence. And I want to make sure that you understand exactly how hard he worked to tell them.

So there's a stipulation that's in the record

If you're doing unlawful activities, are you going to keep detailed reports of what you do? So we looked a few minutes ago at the written retainer. We don't see a lot of written retainer agreements for people doing unlawful things. But beyond that, Mike McMahon does detailed reports, and Exhibit 3034 is one of them. And these reports are critical

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Lustberg

evidence in this case, and the Government uses them, as well, to talk about what Mr. McMahon did. And we'll come back to some of that a little bit later. But this is a report where Mike details his investigative actions. It's one of the reasons why they're not disputed. He did them, and he wrote reports about them. Just not the sort of thing you do if you're working for a foreign government unlawfully.

And I should note that you heard evidence in this trial that part of the scheme that the Chinese had was to ask the others who were involved in this case to delete all of their chats? No such instruction was given to Mike McMahon, because he was not trusted, nor did he delete anything.

Beyond, though, his detailed reports, you've also seen in evidence his invoices which also set forth exactly what he was up to. Again, the Government argues that somehow the way he put money in his accounts, the way he did his taxes, I'll talk about all of that, somehow were meant to conceal what he was up to. But here, he's doing detailed invoices about what he was up to. He's doing detailed reports about what he was doing. This is the exact opposite of what one does if one's trying to conceal their activities.

And I should note in that regard that you heard a good deal of testimony in this case about the fact that Mike McMahon had a Verizon cell phone. That cell phone allowed him, for example, to be tracked using cell site data. If he,

Summation - Mr. Lustberg

like some of the others, some of the Chinese in this case were using WeChat, and, you know, there's WhatsApp here in the U.S. and Signal and there's other of these sorts of things that allow you to use your cell phone secretly, that would be one thing.

But Agent Wheeler, in talking about the cell site data, described this, to the effect of using something like WeChat, which is then you can't track that way. Mike didn't do that. He used his cell phone. He had it on. He didn't, you know, wrap it in aluminum foil, whatever you have to do so it wasn't emitting a beep so that he could be tracked. He was transparent with what he was doing, to the world and even to law enforcement.

I should make one more point about law enforcement. There's been some discussion, and I'll come back to that, as well, a little bit later, of Greg Finning, a friend of Mike McMahon's who worked at the DEA. Mike reported this matter not just to local police, but also to the DEA. And I asked the DEA witness who was present whether she knew whether Mr. Finning was doing some sort of investigation into Chinese money laundering and the like; she didn't know.

But here's the point. If you are -- and I'm repeating myself a little bit, but if you're trying to hide what you're doing through the way you do your taxes, through the way you deposit money, because you -- that would be

Summation - Mr. Lustberg

consciousness of guilt, that would be evidence that you knew you were doing something wrong, that would be evidence that you knew you were working for the Government of China when you shouldn't be. None of that is present here.

Two more points in terms of the circumstantial evidence that we would ask you to think about as you decide whether the Government can fulfill their obligation, if they're going to get a conviction, to show you that Michael McMahon knew that he was working for China.

One is, you've heard evidence of how much money Mike made in this case, \$19,000. We'll come back to that, because he didn't make \$19,000. He also had to pay -- well, actually, we'll do that right now. He also had to pay the fees of others.

So the Government provided you with the top part of this demonstrative exhibit, which it says: McMahon Payments and Expenses. And that's where they get their number of \$19,000. They did not, and this will be a theme, provide you the bottom part, which you know some of it from the testimony, and the rest of it is in evidence in documents, of expenses that Mike had in connection with this investigation, paying other investigators, for example, getting records, and so forth. And those amount to, I can't read it, but something like \$8,000. So the total he makes is actually \$11,000. That's, of course, relevant to the tax issue as well.

Summation - Mr. Lustberg

But the point is that, do you think that somebody who knew they were working for the Government of China would put themselves on the line, would risk their whole careers and lives for \$11,000? It just doesn't make sense.

And when he was arrested on October 28, 2020, Mike, who was, you've heard, an experienced cop who had, himself, interrogated suspects, spoke to the authorities for an hour and a half, fully cooperating with them, as they said, and admitting, as we have with all of you here today, exactly what he did, which was surveillance. That is not the conduct of somebody who is trying to hide what he did. That is not the conduct of somebody who knew that he was working for a foreign government.

Ladies and gentlemen, these common sense questions I'm asking, would someone have done this, really answer themselves. And just as Judge Chen will instruct you, the lack of evidence that Mike knew, that he was ever told, that he ever told anyone that he was working for the People's Republic of China creates reasonable doubt. So this circumstantial evidence is powerful evidence, indeed, not against Mr. McMahon as the Government says, but in favor of him.

But let's turn to their arguments about what they say shows that Michael McMahon, circumstantial evidence that they say shows that Michael McMahon knew he was working for

Summation - Mr. Lustberg

the People's Republic of China.

Let's start here. Critical piece of evidence in this case was the article from the China Daily. It's Exhibit 434, and you remember that. I want to address this article, because this becomes a critical piece of evidence as to whether Mike McMahon -- it should have caused him to know that he was working for China. But a couple things about it. First, as you can see, it confirms that the subject of his investigation, Mr. Zhu, was charged with embezzlement, stolen money, which is exactly what Mike thought he was trying to locate and recover.

Now, the Government insinuates that he should have known he was working for the Chinese Government because that poster mentions something called Operation SKYNET. Look at every single communication in this case, and you will never find a single communication to Mike McMahon that says what — that mentions Operation SKYNET, that says what Operation SKYNET was supposed to be, that mentions Operation FOXHUNT, which you've also heard something about. And based upon, and it's your own recollection and perception that governs, but based upon what I heard, it seems like the people who know about this are either experts, like Professor Wedeman, who spent his entire career studying China, or Chinese people like the victims of this offense who quite understandably are very focused on these Chinese programs. You will recall that Eric

| Case 1 | ::21-cr-00265-PKC   |
|--------|---|
|        | <b>5015</b> Summation - Mr. Lustberg 2021                     |
| 1      | Gallowitz, for example, had never heard of it either. And you |
| 2      | heard that Special Agent Dietz, who is from the U.S.          |
| 3      | Attorney's office here in the Eastern District of New York,   |
| 4      | said he himself had never heard of it.                        |
| 5      | And I questioned Agent Dietz and said here's my               |
| 6      | question and answer, this is on pages 467 and 68 of the       |
| 7      | transcript, for your notes.                                   |
| 8      | QUESTION: So do I it says: Interpol launches                  |
| 9      | global dragnet for 100 Chinese fugitives.                     |
| 10     | And I ask him: This is one of the documents that              |
| 11     | you testified about earlier, correct? And it says it          |
| 12     | says it's called Operation SKYNET. Do you see that?           |
| 13     | ANSWER: I don't see that. I can't read that, but I            |
| 14     | recall that.  |
| 15     | QUESTION: It says it's called Operation SKYNET.               |
| 16     | Have you ever heard of Operation SKYNET?                      |
| 17     | ANSWER: I have never heard of Operation SKYNET.               |
| 18     | And you examined these documents, correct?                    |
| 19     | Yes.  |
| 20     | And they don't explain what Operation SKYNET is, do           |
| 21     | they?   |
| 22     | I don't recall 100 percent of it, but no.                     |
| 23     | One other piece of information that you heard during          |
| 24     | Professor Wedeman's testimony is worth your consideration. I  |
| 25     | asked Professor Wedeman:                                      |

```
Case 1:21-cr-00265-PKC Document 302 Filed 08/30/24 Page 91 of 219 PageID #:
                         Summation - Mr. Lustberg
                                                              2023
 1
               MR. LUSTERBERG (CONTINUING): But the evidence is,
 2
     and you've heard this from one of the government agents -- I'm
 3
     not exactly recalling who it is right now -- that sometimes
 4
     there's criminal investigations in civil matters that operate
 5
     side by side.
               THE COURT: Mr. Lustberg, I am so sorry to do this
 6
 7
     to you, but it is just a couple of minutes before 1:00 .
 8
               MR. LUSTBERG:
                               Sure.
 9
               THE COURT: And unfortunately because of my
10
     schedule, we need to break now --
11
               MR. LUSTBERG: Okay, no problem.
12
               THE COURT: -- for lunch.
13
               MR. LUSTBERG: Okay.
14
               THE COURT: So obviously I will let you restart and
15
     maybe recapitulate where you ended just now.
16
               MR. LUSTBERG: No worries. Thank you.
               THE COURT: And we will resume at 2:00.
17
18
               So remember, ladies and gentlemen, do not talk about
19
     the case, keep an open mind and do not do any research.
20
               Thank you, Mr. Lustberg.
21
               MR. LUSTBERG:
                               Thank you.
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
22
23
                (Jury exits.)
24
               THE COURT: Folks, I will see you at 2:00.
25
                (Luncheon recess taken.)
```

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

trying to get him to come back to China so that they could prosecute him, and the Government there cut off that statement and didn't go on to remind you of what was said just a couple minutes later on that videotape. So Ms. Canti will pull that up for you now, hopefully.

There we go.

And, so, just a few pages later, the DOJ agent says, and that was, you recall was Agent Ross, was, did she say what the consequences were like you was he gonna, and Mr. McMahon says, no, he didn't say nothing, just to, you know, pay back the money basically. Agent McCarthy says, okay, and the DOJ agent said, and did they mention, you know, jail or doing time? And Mr. McMahon says, no, that was never discussed.

So why do I bring that up with all of you? For a couple of reasons. First, I think it's important to just set the context for the statement. Mr. McMahon had been, I believe that the agent said this was about — it was early in the morning. Mr. McMahon had been arrested early in the morning. He was being questioned about events that had occurred four years ago, four years before, I should say. He had never been spoken to by law enforcement during that time period, and he made the statements that they attributed to him but he also reiterated his view of what the mission was here to, you know, pay back the money basically, that that's what he was trying to accomplish. And, of course, that was

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

entirely consistent with what he understood his purpose was, to take steps to get his client repaid.

And there's numerous places in this record that you've heard where that is perfectly clear. For example, if we could go to Government Exhibit 805-B page 20, Johnny Ju says to Mr. McMahon, is there any way to get all the assets and property info from the company but not only the bank records? Is there any way you can track their hidden assets like stock, bonds, investment activities, and Mr. McMahon says, yes, I can possibly do that, I can run the company and the office numbers. And there — and elsewhere.

So let's take a look at Government Exhibit 2029, so that last quote was Johnny Ju. This quote is from Eric Yan, again, you remember that's an alias for Hu Ji, and he says on the first page, okay -- I'm sorry, Mike says, okay, thanks for clarifying. I'm meeting my contact tomorrow and see what he can do about accessing China bank. I will also discuss obtaining offshore accounts of subjects, get pricing for you.

The next page, Eric makes clear that his request is a background of somebody named Joseph Yang, which we haven't heard any evidence of, and then offshore property investigation of Xu Jin, Yu Fang, and Xu Xinzi, an investigation of an account.

Again, I'm just raising this to reiterate really what Mr. McMahon understood he was doing was trying to recover

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

assets for a party that had been embezzled from. That was his mission. It was not his mission to work with the Chinese government and he was deceived into believing he was not working with the Chinese government to put somebody in jail. At 7:00 o'clock in the morning, he uses a word, prosecute, and I understand, you know, why the government jumped all over the use of that word, but I would ask you to take the whole thing in context, to look at all of the evidence and to evaluate

what Mr. McMahon's actual intent was.

But the government goes on and they point to other things that I want to address with you now. So, you've heard their summation and you saw during the trial their evidence about deposits that Mr. McMahon made into accounts other than his business account. In particular, into his joint account with his wife, Martha Burn, referred to as Mary McMahon, as well as a payment of \$5,000 in cash. So I would like to just briefly address that with you.

Cash, it turns out, is still money and it works and you can get paid in cash, and Eric Gallowitz made clear you can get paid in cash. So Ms. Arfa's statement that there had to be a crime because he got paid in cash is just wrong. But beyond that being just wrong, what ties that. Their argument is that because he got paid cash he must have known he was working for the Chinese government. Think about the missing link to all of that. It's just not there.

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

But remember, also, the context in which that cash was paid according to the government's own argument. What they say is that this cash was paid at the Panera Bread, a public place in Paramus, New Jersey, with a ton of people around. Again, it just doesn't sound in deception or hiding payments or anything like that.

But be that as it may, let's take a quick look at what the government's -- what the payments to Mr. McMahon were. That's the government's demonstrative. And what you see -- and Ms. Arfa candidly pointed this out, is that the money goes into three different places, that's not all cash, right? You know, I can understand the argument that if all the payments were in cash, it would be a big deal it was in cash. But some of it is wired, some of it is paid by check, some of it is paid in cash, some of it goes into his account, some of it goes into his joint account with his wife, some of it goes into his child's account.

Now, just think to yourself, if you were going to hide money, would you put that money in an account in the name of your son which is the exact same name as you? I mean, you see that, the son's name is Michael McMahon, too. Would you put that money in an account in the exact same bank as your own account? Would you put that account with that money into your joint account with your wife? It just doesn't make sense. It's not hiding anything from anybody. And there's

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

nothing wrong with a person who has a -- he has his own business as an investigator. He could have easily taken the money into his account -- I'm sorry, could have taken it into the business account, taken it out, put it into his joint account, or taken it out and spent it. Instead, it goes into the -- into his joint account.

I should note that you heard some evidence in this case, and it's Exhibit 3061, that their came a time where their were actually difficulties that -- with people who were paying Mr. McMahon were having in depositing the money into his business account. So one of the reasons it goes into the -- into his personal account as opposed to going to the business account is because they were having trouble -- they were simply having trouble depositing it.

The government argues that that somehow is evil, that that somehow shows criminality, that that somehow shows knowledge that he was working for the Chinese. In fact, what is shows is their was a transaction difficulty. But this is sort of the pattern this prosecution is to take everyday innocent actions and somehow try to make them seem sinister in order to convict Mr. McMahon. It's not just not right.

And one more thing because they talk about the money going into Mr. McMahon's son, Mikey's account, which was, as you heard, a student account. You saw evidence in this case that he was born in 1968, and the theory is that that was

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

2030

1 somehow done to hide money. And, again, think to yourself 2 whether it makes sense that the way you hide money is by 3 putting it in a different account in same name, albeit a 4 different person, his son, in the same bank and so forth. 5 look what happens to that money. At the point in which they 6 put that money in, and you'll have the account statement --7 actually, Ms. Canti, if you can pull that up, it's 8 Government Exhibit 403-I. And Government Exhibit 403-I shows 9 what happens to the money in that account.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First of all, it's not like the money goes in on day one and comes out on day two. It sits there for a little while but it's put in the account when the account has like \$50 or so of balance. I think it's \$58 or something like that, and it gets used by Mr. McMahon's son to pay everyday expenses at that point such as bagels and burgers and pizza and Dunkin and it looks like vapes. Until at some point, Mr. McMahon's son gets paid. You can see he gets paid by the job he has in construction, you can see that, and at that point, it turns out that the McMahon's also have a credit card bill due, and you saw that information about the credit card. So they take out the \$3,000 to make the credit card payment. But it's just a stretch to say that this is somehow evidence of criminal intent. It's just not fair and close to the mark to say that it is evidence that Mr. McMahon was somehow acting as an unregistered agent of China. Does this sent of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

2031

transactions make it sound to you like what he's trying to do is -- that somehow it shows that he knew he was working for China? I just can't make that work as a matter of logic. It doesn't even as a matter of hiding the money because it's such a bad job of hiding it, but beyond that, how does this show knowledge that you're working for China? It just doesn't make sense.

The government also, to move on to their next point, they make some arguments with regard to taxes, and Ms. Arfa arqued that Mr. McMahon did not report this income on his tax returns in an effort to hide it from the government. That was her -- that was her argument. Let's take a look at Exhibit 452 which was introduced at trial, and Ms. Arfa actually had a different demonstrative that she used this morning which I don't have, but the basic argument is that a certain amount of money came into the -- into his business account and he declared a certain amount of money on their taxes. But think about what's missing there. And I asked the agent who was testifying about it. The amount of money that you put on your tax returns, and you saw the tax returns, is called gross profit, that's profit before taxes, but profit requires you to look at what you've took in and what you've paid out and what you know, because you heard the evidence in this case, is that Mr. McMahon did not even get all of that profit. What he -- in order to calculate his profit, you

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

2032

would have to look at what he took in and what he paid for the other investigators --

MR. HEERAN: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LUSTERBERG: With what he paid out to Eric Gallowitz for example, and the other expenses that he -that he had. It just stands to common sense. But even leaving that aside, there's -- you know that he got paid \$19,000. They're saying that he had -- that he had \$50,000 or some amount like that in total -- in total money into his account and only declared less than that. Well, how do we know that what he didn't declare was the money from these transactions? I mean, there may be other transactions that for whatever reasons were not declared. There just was no analysis that the government did to show you that there was any kind of tax issue. And beyond that, he's not charged with tax evasion, he not charged with filing false returns, he's not charged with all of this. Tell me, I just don't get it, how all of that amounts to hiding the fact that he was working for the Chinese government from our government.

In the worst case scenario, there was taxes that he should have paid that he didn't but we don't even know it was on this income as opposed to other income because we know from that chart there was income. He made \$19,000 gross on this over a two-year period and there's much more money than that

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

on these charts, so we don't even know what it is that he
didn't declare and it's unfair and it's unwarranted to say
that what this shows is that he was trying to hide these funds
from our government because, somehow, he was trying to hide
from them that he was working from the Chinese. It just

doesn't make sense.

And think about it from a common sense perspective when you consider how much weight the government is putting on that fact as a basis for saying that he was hiding -- somehow, that he was working for the Chinese government from them.

The government also seeks to blame Mr. McMahon for obtaining information from Greg Finning, the Assistant Special Agent in charge of the New York -- I think it was the New York DEA office, but as the witness who actually testified on that, Neviene Habeeb made clear that if someone did anything wrong, it was Mr. Finning. It was somebody within that agency. They're blaming Mr. McMahon for obtaining information from his friend, but there is not one email, there is not one text, there's not one piece of evidence, there's not one witness who says in doing that, he -- for that matter, even Mr. Finning, he knew that he was doing something wrong. And he may not have been, they haven't put in any proof that he did anything wrong.

There was some proof adduced that Mr. Finning should not have shared that information with him, that's true, but to

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

2034

1 scribe that to him, to say that that shows that he was trying 2 to hide the fact that he was working for the Chinese 3 government, to hide the fact that is just something that's just -- again, use your common sense and ask yourself whether 4 5

that makes sense to you.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Finally, in terms of the government's proofs, the government argues that Mr. McMahon's knowledge that he was working for the Chinese can somehow be shown by virtue of his having violated the rules of the New Jersey Motor Vehicle Commission, which you remember I thought was called something else. But -- and, in fact, let's look at that evidence and think about it a little bit.

It is the fact, and we never disputed, and the evidence shows that Mr. McMahon ran plates relevant to this matter on April 6, 2017. Doing that generated a record. generated that record that's before you now, Exhibit 408-H, where you can see that Mr. McMahon ran those plates on April 6, 2017. So far from hiding, by doing what he did, by using that database as opposed to any of the other databases that Mr. Gallowitz talked about as out there, he made it clear to the world, or at least to the New Jersey MVC what he was doing.

So the government argues, well, he violated his user agreement by passing along that information, and in particular, violated paragraph 9 of the user agreement which

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

says that the program participant is strictly prohibited from using commission records to conduct surveillance, and it goes on.

But remember what Ms. O'Connor from the MVC told you. She told you that the MVC can and does audit people's — the users of this CAIR program, CAIR is C-A-I-R, and in particular, that Mr. McMahon had been audited, and he explained in connection with that audit, that he was running plates in order to show what the — that a car was owned rather than leased. And think about that and that was apparently okay because he gave that answer to MVC and they appeared to be satisfied.

Here, that's -- again, goes exactly to this issue of trying to ascertain assets. Whether you own or lease a car has a great deal to do with what your assets are if you're trying to recover assets. And by the way, if you look at the exhibit that I talked about, that is Exhibit 408-I, that's the -- okay, this is something else. I don't know if you have 408-I.

Well, actually since 408-D and C are up, I will just mention that Mr. McMahon was not hiding the fact that he was a private investigator who was getting information pursuant to this New Jersey MVC CAIR program, and it explains in his initial application which was D, what his purpose was, which was to, you know, to be able to get information for people

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

whose law firms he was working with including to investigate fraud and 408-C says to -- the next year, to get information on the cases he's working on with various law firms.

But the point is here, when you look at 408-I, which is this audit that was done, what you see is that the -- he, you know, he explained that he did this audit in order to determine whether a car was leased or owned. I asked Ms. O'Connor, was that an appropriate use, under the agreement, of the database, she said yes, and that's what's going on here and I'm not just making that up. Because if we look at Exhibit 805-B page 9, you'll see that Mike sends Johnny a screen shot and says exactly here, the car is owned, not leased. Johnny responds, got it. No finance, no lease. Mike responds, correct.

That was the purpose of this. So before we start to think what he was doing was so wrong in terms of violating this user agreement in New Jersey Motor Vehicle Commission, it apparently isn't. And beyond that, how, again, does it show, in any regard, that he knew he was working for the Chinese government which is what Counts One and Two are about.

So, respectfully, each of these examples that the government raised represents, in my view at least, the government stretching to make criminal that which is not and which, in some cases, for example, where Mike McMahon puts his money is really the perfectly innocent actions of everyday

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

life. And your role to well and truly try this case, which was the oath that you took, you shouldn't be swayed by this kind of effort to examine a person's life or turn it upside down or look at it in microscopic detail to question this transaction of that violation of an agreement, to look at who you associated with, because Judge Chen will tell you that guilt by association is not allowed, to take a picture of three people in a Panera Bread and say, see that, there's a crime and not just any crime but the crime of being an agent of a foreign government.

The efforts that the government makes to try to find a crime here speak volumes. What they show is that there really is no real evidence, which is where I started. And that lack of evidence pretty clearly is not for lack of trying on their part. The evidence is lacking with regard to Counts One and Two because Mike is innocent. He's certainly not guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. So let me conclude by just addressing the stalking charges for a few minutes.

So, there's this charge of interstate stalking and the government put up and Judge Chen will instruct you that in order to be convicted of interstate stalking, the government has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, first, that the defendant traveled in interstate or foreign commerce as charged in the indictment, second, that he traveled in interstate commerce with the intent to harass or place under

surveillance with the intent to harass or intimidate, in this
case Mr. Ju, Ms. Liu, and Xu Xinzi, and, third, that in the
course of the result of such travel, the defendant caused,
attempted to cause, or reasonably expected to cause them
substantial emotional distress. I'm going to outline for you
why I think those elements are not met, not even close, with
regard to Mr. McMahon and each of these requirements.

First, there is no proof, and the government conceded that Mr. McMahon never traveled in interstate, period. He was in New Jersey the whole time and that's why the government told you this morning, they admitted that to you, but said that he aided and abetted somebody else's travel. You'll have an instruction about what aiding and abetting is, but, you see, you have to have knowledge of what they're doing and I just didn't see any evidence in this case that Mr. McMahon did anything to aid and abet somebody else's interstate travel. If you can find it, then that element will be satisfied. I'm just not seeing it in that record.

But leaving that technical requirement aside, there's also not one iota of proof that Mr. McMahon harassed or intimidated anyone, let alone that he agreed to do so, much less that he intended to and expected to cause substantial emotional distress to the alleged victims here. So why do I say that?

First, and really most fundamentally, there's no

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

evidence that Mr. McMahon was ever seen by any of them. had the opportunity to question each of the those three victims, none of them had ever met, talked to, or seen Mr. McMahon and, he remained covert throughout the entire time of this -- of this surveillance. No one ever reported seeing him, other than the other -- maybe, and we don't even know if it was him, one of the other -- one of the people who was actually doing surveillance, that is Hong Ju Jin, directly for the Chinese. And not only did that surveillance remain

You remember, and the government pointed to this morning, that Mr. Goldberger said, may be overt surveillance in their face, sit in front of the house, pictures, videos, scare them. And Mr. McMahon said, yeah, possibly, we did that in Little Ferry, obviously referring to a different investigation, and then said, not sure it worked, but it matters not, because as you also saw, this was — this whole idea was vetoed. So the idea there was an agreement to do this is just completely unsupported by the evidence.

covert, it even remained covert in the face of a proposal by

Eric Gallowitz that it not be covert.

To the contrary, there was a lack of an agreement.

There was -- and somebody else, not Mr. McMahon, proposed it.

The government says, well, he should have reacted more

strongly and said no way or something like that, but that's

not harassment to say no way. It didn't happen. It was not

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

1 agreed to. Mr. McMahon ran it by the client who said no.

That's the critical evidence here. There was never any agreement. Instead what happened here was good old fashion covert surveillance the whole time. But one of the things that the government argued today and argued as well in its opening, is that Mr. McMahon provided the addresses that were used so that surveillance could take place so that they knew where Mr. Ju was and where his daughter was. There's at least reasonable doubt with regard to that. It's a little unclear and it's a little unclear because here's one thing you know; Mr. McMahon was not the only one doing surveillance.

So, how do we know? What is the evidence that he was the one who provided the addresses? There were other people doing surveillance at exactly that time. There's no doubt that Mr. McMahon did surveillance and traced them to the house, but there's no communications that would indicate that while this other surveillance was going on, that they were not the ones to find it. I don't know what the answer is, but you have to know what the answer is, beyond a reasonable doubt, in order to convict him.

But, second, you heard something else during this trial and it was summarized by Special Agent Tarkin during his testimony, that the Short Hills address and the Warren address were, according to public records, both owned -- both of those residences were owned by the same company, a company called

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg 2042

(Continuing.)

MR. LUSTERBERG: That's where the two men came to the house there in Warren and knocked on the door and put notes on the door and so forth.

The Government argues that somehow those people —
think they argue that somehow those people got the address of
that place from Mr. McMahon. But there is no evidence that
that's true. In fact, you know because you heard the
testimony from Kuang Zebin that they got instructions about
where to go from somebody named Chaohong Chen, and no
evidence, none, was produced that linked Chaohong Chen to
Michael McMahon or to any of the people with whom Michael
McMahon was in touch. No evidence of it. So this idea that
somehow he provide the address, even assuming that he was the
one who found it, so that that incident could took place is
completely based on speculation.

Likewise, the Government argues that Mr. McMahon provided the information with regard to the whereabouts of the address of Mr. Zhu's daughter, Sabrina, in California. But if you read Mr. McMahon's report, what he says -- and that report is in the fall of 2016 -- is he puts her address at the time in at Stanford University. I'm not going to go into the specific addresses. But he says in his report -- and this is Exhibit 3028 -- it appears Xinzi Xu is a graduate student at Stanford University. She lives in the Kennedy graduate

there.

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

residences. But that wasn't true. He got it wrong. He got it wrong because she had actually graduated, you heard evidence of this from Stanford, in May of 2016, and she testified that by the fall of 2016, she was no longer living

Why is that relevant? It's relevant because the Government's argument is that somehow, Mr. McMahon gave information that allowed the harassment of her to continue. But there was no harassment at that address, and, in fact, the harassment of her to which he testified, had to do with Facebook posts. And you'll remember that Facebook post, it was Government Exhibit 107. But the Government showed no link, none, whatsoever, between the author of that report — it was someone named Tony Li — and Mike McMahon, not directly, not indirectly, not through Jason Zhu, not through

Johnny Zhu, not through Eric Yan, nothing. So they're trying

to build links that are just not supported by the evidence,

and I would ask you to hold them to their burden.

Finally, in that regard, finding the address was not even necessary to harassment. Here's what I mean by that:

You heard what happened, that in 2019. Now, just to back up,

Mr. McMahon didn't do anything after April 2017 in this case.

The knock on the door and all that in Warren occurs in

September 2018, and then letters are sent, that you heard about, in 2019. There's nothing that links Mr. McMahon to

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg

those letters. There's -- and those letters go to the Short Hills address, but were conveyed to the Warren -- to Mr. Xu living in Warren.

So first of all, what does that tell you? It tells you that if the Chinese wanted to harass Mr. Xu, they could send stuff to Short Hills. They didn't even need that Warren address, because once it was sent to Short Hills, it was conveyed quickly, and there was some cross-examination about this, to Short Hills. And that stuff includes the video that you saw earlier this week. Although, if I recall that testimony, I'm not sure if that was ever actually opened. But either way.

And I should say one last thing: It really bears just mention that to me, at least, there's real doubt, as much as Ms. Arfa says that the recipients were terrified, I'm sure they were scared. Mr. Xu made clear that he was scared to go back to China where he would face punishment for crimes in which they were accused, who knows whether justly or unjustly, and, in fact, I think he said he was afraid of being executed. But there's some reason to doubt, whether on top of that fear, he suffered substantial emotional distress as a result of anything that Mr. McMahon did during that time that he was involved in the surveillance. Just a few facts in that regard. Again, Mr. McMahon was never seen, so there was really nothing that he specifically did.

Summation - Mr. Lusterberg 2045

But remember this, when Mr. Xu's father was here, and you heard testimony about this, what did the family do? They essentially turned him over to the people who were in Newark, Tu Lan and them, who they understood to be the Chinese authorities. Makes you wonder how scared they really could have been. And likewise, Liu Yan testified that she had a list of phone numbers and she started calling the people with those Chinese phone numbers, the same people that you saw in this chart earlier. And so their too, it just makes you wonder, were they really that as frightened or testified as Ms. Arfa describes. They did say they were scared. I will note that Mr. Xu said the first time he really felt physically scared was in September 2018 when people came to his house, which again, is a year and a half after Mr. McMahon is no longer involved in any of this.

Let me say this, and I want to conclude now: I really understand why the Government wishes to protect this family from the People's Republic of China. I really do. The evidence in this case does show just how far China is willing to go to repatriate those who they wish to prosecute, as I said, whether justly or unjustly; doesn't matter. And the video you saw earlier this week is a great example of their incredible manipulativeness and deceit in doing that. You heard that there's no extradition treaty with the U.S. And they shouldn't be allowed to act in the extra-legal way that

SUMMATION - MR. GOLDBERGER

1 MR. GOLDBERGER: Good afternoon.

Is that better?

3 THE JURY: Yes.

MR. GOLDBERGER: Okay. Good afternoon, everybody.

In my many, many, many years of doing this, this is the best example of when people say that in the United States, we have an adversarial system of justice okay. Adversarial meaning that it's the United States against. If it's a state case, it's the People of the State of New York against. If it's -- it's always adversarial. There are places in the world that do not have adversarial systems, but this is what we've had from the beginning, and this is what we live with, and there are very good things about it, and there are some things that are not so good about it.

And so one of the problems with the system is that sometimes, the Government, as in this case, goes off a little bit from where they should be. And by that, I mean, my client should not be here. Here's why: So let's talk about it.

Number one, he was called by Mr. Chen. You've heard that name before. Mr. Chen is from California. Mr. Chen, as you may or may not recall, employed Mr. Kuang, the man who testified in this case, against my client.

To show you the issue of adversarialness in terms of cases in Court, Mr. Kuang, if you remember, his name was

Vincent Kuang, Mr. Kuang started discussions with the

SUMMATION - MR. GOLDBERGER

1 Government some years ago.

MR. HEEREN: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Hold on one second.

Overruled. But ladies and gentlemen, I just want to remind you that these are arguments and the question as to what the evidence shows in terms of the facts is up to you. So obviously, you needn't just accept whatever the parties say to you are the facts, okay.

Continue, Mr. Goldberger.

MR. GOLDBERGER: If you think that I -- let's be clear, if you think that I say anything to you that's incorrect or that I've on purpose in any way, shape, or form misstated the fact, just disregard it, okay. Just disregard it. I'm going to try not to do that because that doesn't help my client if you think that I'm not telling you truth or if you think that I'm not relating the facts. So let's make sure we understand that.

Mr. Kuang testified, and he testified that it was a phone call from Chen in California that both he and my client got well back in 2018. Now, Mr. Kuang then said in further testimony before you, the jury, that what he did was, he remembered that my client wrote those notes, the notes that, one, was put on the door, and two, that were eventually taken down and so forth and so on. And he told the Government prosecutors and the FBI agents right from day one, that's what

SUMMATION - MR. GOLDBERGER

2050

1 happened. Those notes were, if you remember, he said 2 something along the lines that they had been in the glove compartment of my client's car, the car that had been driven 3 4 up to New Jersey. And he continued with the fact to lie, 5 because eventually here in front of you, he eventually said, yeah, you're right, I wrote the notes, all three of them. 6 7 how is it that the Government department know he wrote the 8 notes? Because he lied to the prosecutors, all of them 9 sitting here, the best and the brightest that we have. 10 lied to them. He lied to the FBI agents month after month. Every time he had what they call a proffer session, he went 11 12 into that session with those agents and those prosecutors and 13 he lied about who wrote the notes. Why would he do that? 14 Because what he was hoping for was a deal, a deal with the Government, and eventually, he got that deal, even in spite of 15 the fact that he lied to them for two years. 16 They still gave 17 him the deal. How is that possible? Because you know when 18 you lie to a federal agent or you lie to a federal prosecutor, 19 that, in and of itself, is a violation of U.S. Code 1001. 20 That's a crime. You can't lie to an FBI agent. You can't lie 21 to an IRS agent. You can't lie to one of these people. 22 Never. You're not allowed to. It's a crime. And yet, he 23 lied time after time, after time. And then eventually, 24 somehow, just before coming in here to court to testify, now 25 he says, you're right, I wrote the notes.

SUMMATION - MR. GOLDBERGER

Well, how is it that they didn't know long ago that he wrote the notes? They had experts here about DNA and about fingerprints and about all kinds of things. Could you imagine how many different experts you heard here talking about the various things? How is it that nobody ever once did a handwriting exemplar in terms of Mr. Kuang? Because if you did a handwriting exemplar, you would have known immediately that those were his notes, and not my client's.

MR. HEEREN: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, this is argument.

MR. GOLDBERGER: Why is it important? Well, Kuang still has his deal. The deal is still in place. He's got a cooperation agreement with the Government. Even though, even though he lied for, you tell me, year, two years? But they still gave him the cooperation agreement and they're still going to when -- when it comes time for the judge, they're still going to present that cooperation to the judge. What kind of leniency they ask for or they don't, I don't know. I don't think anybody knows at this point. But why do they continue to have an agreement with somebody that lied to them for two years? How do they know he didn't lie other things? It's an adversarial system. You know what they want? They want a conviction. They want a conviction of everybody sitting at that table. That's what they want. And that's not

SUMMATION - MR. GOLDBERGER

what we want, nor do I think we should get.

Now, what's interesting to me is the other day, it wasn't that long ago, you nice people heard a lady named Wheeler who was an FBI agent, part of what they call, the cast, and she talked about the various cell towers and how you get the various information about what telephones were used and where and when and so forth and so on. And so she prepared a document which was referred to in her testimony regarding phones that were mapped in the report. In other words, as it says on a further page, the phones that were believed to be important, are believed to be associated with the conspiracy to act -- this is in evidence, this is an exhibit, so you can take a look at it if you want to -- the target cell phones are believed to be associated with a conspiracy to act as agents of a foreign Government and interstate stalking in 2017 and 2018.

There are five phones that are mentioned in that -in this statement. And Vincent Kuang's is one of them. You
know whose is not? My client. His phone is not mentioned in
those. And the other part of it that's interesting is it says
phones not mapped, but referenced in the report, one of those
phones belongs to Chen Chaohang. That's the guy in California
who made the phone calls who got this from, his point of view,
my client's point of view, got this started. So -- and if you
remember, there's a document in this exhibit which indicates

SUMMATION - MR. GOLDBERGER

that there was a phone call at 1:00 o'clock while Kuang and my client were present at that home in New Jersey, and it was with Chen. It was between Kuang and Chen, Kuang and Chen.

Now, what did my client know? What did my client know about what was going on? First of all, what you learned about Mr. Chen in California was that he was in the marijuana business, okay, which is what you were told by Mr. Kuang, and that he also had some sort of restaurant business, and that Mr. Kuang knew him pretty well because he paid Mr. Kuang \$3,000 a month to watch the marijuana store. Okay. My client didn't work for him. There's no evidence of that whatsoever. What there is evidence of is my client driving up to New Jersey with Kuang, okay, and we will discuss that at length because that's what their case is about.

Now, I just want all of you jurors to, when you examine each witness and you examine each piece of evidence, I just want you to do it with a fair and open mind, okay.

Mr. Kuang is a liar. He has been a liar in terms of the Government for two years. He wrote the notes. He's the one who went there.

Now, let's go through what happened up in New Jersey because that's important. Up until -- well, let's go back for one second. I'm sorry. What is it that Chen -- and by the way, the most important witness that I'm sure the judge will tell you in her charge -- Judge Chen will tell you that both

2054 1 sides have the ability to subpoena witnesses. There's no 2 question. Both sides had the ability to subpoena witnesses. 3 However, there's a huge difference. The burden of proof in 4 this case and in every criminal case in America is only on one 5 side, right here. We have no burden, whatsoever. The judge will tell you that in her charge. We have no burden 6 7 whatsoever to call a witness, to do anything. We can sit 8 there. I don't even have to stand up here and talk to you at 9 the end of it and still say to you, find my client not guilty. 10 So they have the burden of proof. Let me ask you a question that I want you to ask 11 12 yourselves: If there was a witness in this case that you would like to hear what his conversations were with Chen or 13 14 supposedly with my client -- with Kuang, excuse me, wouldn't 15 it be Chen? MR. HEEREN: Objection, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. Careful. 18 Again, ladies and gentlemen, as I'll remind you 19 during my instructions, I want to you to focus on evidence 20 before you, not anything that isn't before you. MR. GOLDBERGER: I'll repeat, we have no burden of 21 22 proof. They have the burden of proof. They have to convince you beyond a reasonable doubt. Okay. So let's go back. 23 24 There's a phone call -- this is in September of 25 2018, September -- the phone call from Chen was either

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

24

25

SUMMATION - MR. GOLDBERGER

ER 2055

September 3rd or September 4th. He has phone calls with both my client and with Mr. Kuang. And what he asks -- and this is why it's really really important, because there are two counts, the first two counts in this indictment that you're going to have to deliberate on that are answered immediately for those conversations, okay. And that is, are you working for the Chinese Government? And the answer is, what does Chen tell either Kuang or my client in those conversations? What does he tell him? Do you remember what Kuang said? The Government says, now he as a truth teller. So we can now believe him. He says, it's a dai lo. Remember the expression, a dai lo that wants this done. He wants this person threatened in some way, shape, or form or informed in some way, shape, or form. That person is supposed to be a dai lo. A dai lo is a

gangster. A dai lo is a person who is part of a triad. It's not the Government. Clearly not the Government. So that's what Mr. Kuang and supposedly my client know when they determined to go up to New Jersey, that they're doing this as

20 a favor to Chen, no money, ever, ever, ever passes hands.
21 Nothing. Zero. Okay. And maybe for Kuang that's

understandable, he works for the guy he watches his marijuana

and so forth and so on. My client doesn't work for him. It's

a favor. He's going to drive Mr. Kuang up to New Jersey.

Ask yourselves the question then, why for two years,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUMMATION - MR. GOLDBERGER

2056

does Kuang continue to say that my client wrote the notes? Why does he tell the Government that? He wants, what? doesn't want the responsibility of what the notes say? doesn't want the responsibility that he's going to be under more severe pressure from the Government? Well, I'll tell you why the Government shows you why Counts One and Two have no bearing in terms of either Kuang or my client. They let Kuang plead quilty to the interstate stalking or the conspiracy to stalk interstate. He didn't plead quilty to either one of the counts that dealt with working for China. Neither of them. That's after lying to them for almost two years. How is that? How is that possible? If he was working for China or he thought he was working for China, why wouldn't the Government at that point since he's -- now they found out that he's been lying to them for two years, why wouldn't they finally say to him, you know what, you're going to have to plead guilty to this whole indictment? Because he couldn't because he wasn't working for China, in his mind. He didn't know anything about working for China. What he knew about was, I'm being asked a favor to go up there and do what I'm supposed to do, which is, you know, put some kind of note there. So he finally admits that he goes home and he writes three notes. They're evidently carbon copies of each other. So let's talk for a second about the notes. is no question, I think, that the evidence if you look at it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUMMATION - MR. GOLDBERGER

2057

fairly and carefully, that my client probably or certainly or most likely knew what was in those notes, even though he didn't write it. There were three notes put on the door. client had the tape dispenser, put tape on the door. You saw the videotape, they knocked on the door. There was no pounding on the door, there was no yelling, there was no screaming, there was no threats made. Review the video again if you want to. They did go around to the back of the house. At some point, you did hear my client say, I don't think anybody's been here in a long time. So he's clearly there, and I think it's a fair assumption on your part that he probably did know for sure what was in those notes, what was in that note. I think that's a reasonable assumption for a jury to make, even though he didn't write them and even though Government was told that he did write them, that it wasn't Kuang. So what happens? If you remember, there's a phone call and that may have been the phone call at 1:00 o'clock between Kuang and Chen that you saw the FBI agent who was doing the cell phone towers talk about. And then the two of the notes are taken down. There were three notes. Two of the notes are taken down. And you can see, play the video again

if you want to. You see the two notes are being taken down,

notes, and just throws them in the dirt around the property.

and it appears that my client crumples one or both of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUMMATION - MR. GOLDBERGER

2058

Not exactly a great criminal. I mean, you know, if you want to take the notes, you take them with you, you put them in your pocket and then you burn them. You don't throw them on the same property. But be that as it may. So now the note, there's still one note on the door.

But what happens? What happens? There's no further contact that the Government is aware of that it shows to you between Chen and my client or Kuang and my client. They drive back to Brooklyn where Kuang lives, Kuang is deposited at home, my client drives off somewhere. But what happens the What happens the next day is that my client goes next day? back, he goes back to the property by himself. It's on video. Please replay it. Replay it, because I think it's important. Because this deals with the question of interstate stalking and the case itself. He goes back and what he's trying to do -- and it's pretty clear. He walks up to the door, okay, and you sort of lose sight of him for a second, but he's at the door. Now, it appears probably that the lady of the house has already taken the note down, put it in that bag, and saved it for the FBI. So he's at the door for only a few seconds, and then he turns around, and you'll see him, and he walks away, and he's walking back to his car and he drives away.

What he's doing is he's trying to get the last note out of there. He's trying, without legally, technically think about it, what he's trying to do is he's trying to withdraw

SUMMATION - MR. GOLDBERGER

from what he did before. He knows what he did the day before is wrong. He's trying to make it write by, let's get the last note. He thinks two notes are already gone. Let me get the last note, and there are no notes anymore. He didn't think anybody was home. They walked around the house. So he's trying to do the right thing. He does not want to commit a crime. He wants to withdraw from this so-called conspiracy.

Is there any other thing that you could think of as to why he would go back there on his own? Kuang didn't know he went back. He didn't testify to it. And there's no information in the record that Chen and my client had any further conversations. So why is he going back? He's going back to take down the last night and try to make it right. It's like, you can't just -- and the judge will charge on this -- you can't just think to yourself, well, I did something wrong yesterday, okay, it's over, I'm sorry I did it, good bye. No, you've got to do something to try to show people or to make it right, so to speak. So he goes back. It's only thing he can do because there's one note left, at least that's what he thought, because remember, the other two notes had been taken down.

There is no evidence, none, zero, that he had any other involvement whatsoever with Mr. Zhu and his family, the so-called victims in the case. None. Zero. There's no evidence that he did anything else with anybody, at any time.

SUMMATION - MR. GOLDBERGER

Now, some of you may be saying -- and I'm trying not to read minds -- but some of you may say, well, how do we know for sure that that's what he was doing when he went whack, that he was trying to get that last note down because he knows that it had been wrong. But you don't know for sure. No one knows for sure. The only one who knows for sure is him.

How long was he involved in this supposedly probable scheme? Twenty hours? The call with Chen was the night before or the late afternoon before. Chen's in California, three hours earlier, and he talks to -- and he picks up Kuang, because Kuang doesn't have a car. So he drives Kuang, who's got the notes, up to New Jersey. And by the way, if you remember from the testimony, got lost. He didn't know where the place was. He had no idea about this guy, who he was, Mr. Zhu. He didn't know anything about him. Whether he was a terrific guy. He didn't know anything about him at all. And there's no proof in the record that he did. Nothing.

And by the way, why is he doing this? Is there anything in the record? Is there any evidence that he got any money or anything for it? No. Nothing. Is there anything that took place from that day on, from September 4th of 2018, that's what we're talking about now, that's four, five years? Is there anything that you've heard that says this guy is

Summation - Mr. Goldberger 2062

1 (Continuing.)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GOLDBERGER: You're going to have to decide for yourselves whether or not there is sufficient evidence to believe that when he went back on his own without telling anybody and went up to the door, that that was what he had in mind.

Now, Judge Chen is going to charge you on the law probably tomorrow, my guess is, or maybe late this afternoon, I don't know. You really need, you really, really need to listen to her carefully. The law is really, really -- I mean, I'm not just saying this. It's really important that you understand the principles involved. Okay? And there are some principles that are somewhat difficult maybe to fully understand and there are others that will come like natural to you; you'll just feel it. But there is a substantial difference between proof beyond a reasonable doubt, which the Judge will talk to you about, and proof in a civil case, which is a little more than 50 percent on one side than the other. Okay? I mean, you may have read stuff about civil cases because our Former President has been involved in some here in New York and some other places. So we're not getting into politics, but the bottom line is, it's really important to listen to the Judge.

Now, there's another area that we need to talk about. There's a part of the Judge's charge which is really

2

4

5

6

8

9

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

21

24

Summation - Mr. Goldberger 2063

important for you to listen to carefully, and that deals with the question of whether or not there are multiple conspiracies 3 in the same indictment. She's going to give you the instructions on the law. Because if there are more than one conspiracy to find in the indictment, then the jury must acquit even if they believe certain crimes were committed. 7 There can't be -- you can't try two or three conspiracies before one jury. You can't do that. You can only try one. So if you believe that there are two separate conspiracies in 10 this case, which I think there is substantial evidence of, you listen to the Judge's charge. It probably should be the first thing or one of the first things, my suggestion to you, for 13 you to wrestle with. Because there's clearly one set of circumstances that deal with what happened with Mr. Xu and his family and so forth and so on, and then there's another set of circumstances that deal with some of the other people that are involved and what they were doing. There is no evidence in this case as to why Mr. Chen asked the favor, go up there, 19 leave a note. It's for gangsters and whatever, and so forth 20 and so on. So it's not as simple as it looks. In addition to which, one has to wonder. 22 asking the question out loud. You know, whether you end up 23 thinking I'm a jerk or I'm a bad guy or whatever, it doesn't matter a bit. I've been doing this forever. And it's 25 important, it's important more for him than for me. Okay?

Summation - Mr. Goldberger

2064

It's serious business. Because when you lose in a criminal case and a jury says you're quilty, it has huge repercussions on your life. So you have to -- we picked you because we believed you would take it seriously. And I think you have. I think you've paid attention, all of you. Every one of you. You know, it's like a big fish bowl here; we look at you, you look over at us. Maybe sometimes we don't look so smart, we

8 don't look so good, but we're looking. And what we're looking

9 at is: Are they listening? Are they into it? Do they care?

And we think you do. We think you do. Not every jury does;

those are bad picks. We've been through that. But we think

12 you're going to give this a fair shake.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I think that you have to come back to how it -you know, I mean, in terms of the adversarial system, why is it, why is it that the government is willing to lean over not backwards, but almost in tumblesaults to give Kuang -- keep him with his deal after he lies to them for two years? are the people he lied to, right here. Mr. Heeren, he's -- I guess he's the chief prosecutor in this case right now. He's sitting at the end of the table, so we'll give him credit for being chief prosecutor. And then there's the rest of them. They're all smart. Every one of them is smart as a whip, no question. I have lived long enough to know who is smart and who is not, and they're smart. But they got lied to. got lied to. And you know what? They bought into the lies of

what the law is in the case, Judge Chen is the last word.

25

Summation - Mr. Goldberger

2066

1 listen to every word that comes out of her mouth, whether it's

2 | tomorrow or the day after, whenever it is, in terms of how you

3 apply the law to the facts of the case. Okay? Because you

4 have to. You have to all understand and agree that you will

5 | follow what she says on the law. Okay?

9

10

11

12

13

14

20

21

But on the facts, with all due respect, I don't care

7 what she thinks, I don't care what they think. The only thing

8 | what matters is what you think about the facts. This kid went

back there the next day, take that note down. There's nothing

about this kid being a criminal, nothing anywhere. Chen,

Chen, Chen. Where is he? Why isn't he here.

MR. HEEREN: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

But I think Mr. Goldberger is done.

I will give you instructions, ladies and gentlemen,

on how to consider amongst -- you don't consider the fact that

17 some individual was not on trial before you and did not

18 testify. Those will be my instructions. And as

19 Mr. Goldberger said, you should follow those.

MR. GOLDBERGER: All right. I will wrap up, ladies

and gentlemen, because probably enough is enough and you've

22 got one more lawyer to listen to.

So I would like to finish by saying to you that when

24 you go to deliberate with each other, be as respectful to each

other as you would hope people would be to you. Have a

reasonable discussion.

Some of the ideas that have been thrown out by me, for instance, in regard to my client, I think are things that you should be considering. And most importantly of all is that there is zero evidence -- you can ask to have anything read back you want, you can get any exhibits you want, there is zero evidence that my client knew or thought that he was acting on behalf of the Chinese government. There is no evidence. So Counts One and Two, that's what that is.

From my point of view, the only count that you really have to be concerned about with my client is the question of the interstate stalking. When he went back the next day, was he trying to take that note down because it was wrong or was it for some other reason? By the way, if you want, play the tape back again. There was no banging on the doors, which is what somebody said, knock-knock.

Thank you for listening. I wish you all good luck. Not easy being a jury. Thanks again.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Goldberger.

Let me just turn to the jury. I would like to proceed with the next closing, unless someone needs a break?

Okay.

All right. So, Mr. Tung, your summation, please.

MR. TUNG: Hello? Hello?

THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.

Okay, go ahead.

22

23

24

25

MR. TUNG: So bear with me. Sometimes I have to go over there to play the exhibit.

Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, I also like to bring your attention to the fact that my client, Yong Zhu, did not

Summation - Mr. Tung

take the stand to testify to clear up his name. And you will hear -- Judge Chen will instruct you that you should not draw any negative or adverse inference against my client, Yong Zhu, because he did not take the stand to testify. In our criminal justice system, a defendant is never required to take the stand to prove his innocence.

As you all know by now, Yong Zhu has been charged with committing a crime of conspiracy to act as an agent of a foreign government without prior notifications to Attorney General and to engage in interstate stalking.

The very first thing I would like to remind you is, remember, government called a witness, Professor Wedeman, I believe, if I don't remember wrong his name. And he confirmed, I think when I asked, not every Chinese is a member of the Chinese Communist Party. And he also explained the government structure in China. In China, he discussed the structure of the government. And he also stated that the Chinese Communist Party is a monopoly, the controlling party of the Chinese government. So essentially, what Professor says is Chinese government is controlled by the Chinese Communist Party. And since Mr. Yong Zhu, even though he has a green card here, but he's still not a citizen, so he still can be considered as someone with Chinese origin. But we cannot assume that everyone who is Chinese origin, such as Yong Zhu, is automatically an agent of Chinese government. We've still

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Tung

2071

got to look at the evidence and see if he actually acted as an agent for the Chinese government.

I ask you to pay close attention to Judge's instruction regarding the law pertaining to acting as an agent of a foreign government. It is important to understand that according to the law, the government bears the burden, with all responsibility, of presenting evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant, Yong Zhu, knowingly, knowingly acted as an agent for the government or an official of China, Chinese government, while residing in the United States. meet this burden, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was fully aware that his actions were carried out under the direct control or direction of the Chinese government in light of the evidence presented during the trial. I submit to you that the government has failed to satisfy its burden of proof in demonstrating that Yong Zhu knowingly acted as an agent for the Chinese government.

Now, we have heard enough about this story and, as you should know, that upon Yong Zhu's return to the United States back in 2016, his involvement began when he agreed to assist someone in China who requested help to locate an individual in the United States who owed a private debt. Yong Zhu's action led him to contact an attorney, Laping Shi. And you'll remember she took the stand and she was -- and she

Summation - Mr. Tung

2072

1 came here to give testimony pursuant to a subpoena because our 2 office subpoenaed her. It was not because she is a friend of 3 Yong Zhu. As you have heard her testimony, Yong, when she -when he met with the attorney, he never mentioned to the 4 5 Attorney Shi that he was acting upon the request of a Chinese government official to look for someone for the Chinese 6 7 government. Instead, he explicitly stated to the attorney that he was approached by someone in China to help them to 8 9 locate an individual who owed money to that person. 10 Now, you also notice that the Attorney Shi told him that she by herself did not do those kind of work. But she's 11 an attorney, she said this is common practice to locate 12 13 someone, such as to locate defendant's assets, so she's saying 14 she probably knows someone and she actually going through 15 another attorney to find the detective, Private Investigator 16 McMahon here. 17 And Shi, the attorney, prepare a retainer agreement that you have seen yesterday. Let me display it again today 18 19 so that can remain -- refresh your memory. 20 Can I get help from you? 21 THE COURT: Yes. 22 You are going to use the ELMO, right? 23 Okay. This is exhibit? MR. TUNG: This is Defendants' Exhibit A, Yong Zhu 24 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Tung

2073

Now, this first thing is the cover letter, cover What I like to point out now from this e-mail is, remember this morning the government said Yong Zhu sent the retainer to a person in China by the name of Hui Sun who is a government official and he has e-mail address 19960165@gq.com? What the government tried to imply, or maybe they will say this is direct evidence, that Yong Zhu should known he has been talking to government official. But, ladies and gentlemen, looking at this e-mail address alone, gg.com e-mail is just like Yahoo, Gmail.com in the United States. not an official government address such as in this country, such as you end up with dot-organization, dot-gov. From this e-mail, from this e-mail address alone, there is no way for Mr. Yong Zhu to figure out this person is a government official. So this is something I just want to clarify for you. The real purpose for me to show this retainer

The real purpose for me to show this retainer agreement still, I'm -- I mean, bear with me. I know I went through this yesterday, but I still want to point it out and when you have the evidence in front of you. Looking at the scope of the service, it was very clear. He was asked to act as client's family counsel in assisting client to handle the matter involving a licensed private investigator in locating a male subject whose name is, blank, including subject's whereabouts, photos, videos. There's nothing in this retainer

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

agreement that refers or made any references to the work is being done is asking -- is asked by a Chinese government official or the Chinese government.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you remember during the trial, the government has demonstrated in other defendants and they have done also communications there, what they -- that very impressed me because I'm not a technical person, as you can see today, when they talked about, you know, how to extract data from iCloud. Those are very sophisticated technologies they have now. They can look -- they can take our e-mail address and they can match with -- you know, with the data they retrieve from Immigration or Homeland Security or et cetera. And all these people, all those experts come in. And I remember the government spend a day to work on these things to demonstrate how they can prove the people -there's no picture here now. They removed. That's fine, is enough for me. Okay? Those pictures of government officials, Chinese government officials, takes them so much time, but they can't -- they do have the technology to identify them and they can extract the data, and the expert testified they can convert those data to something that's readable by normal people. But, ladies and gentlemen, I'm asking you for one thing: Have you seen any evidence such as text messages, e-mails or other communications that clearly -- not only clear, that states Mr. Yong Zhu was communicating with the

Chinese official at the outset when he took the -- I mean, when he promised -- when he agreed to help someone to locate someone in the United States? Have you seen any of those evidence here? None. None that you can find.

The point I was making is, if the government can locate any such a text message or e-mail messages, communication indicating when that person in China asking my client, Yong Zhu, to do the job, to locate person by Chinese government, they are able to do so, but they -- if it's not here, that means they cannot locate him or they do not even exist.

MR. HEEREN: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Be careful, Mr. Tung.

Ladies and gentlemen, you're not to speculate about evidence that's not before you or individuals you have not heard from, as I will tell you again during the instructions.

MR. TUNG: Now, on the other hand, you can see that my client, Yong Zhu, when he got the -- when he got people asking him, you know, in China asking him to do a job to locate person, he wanted to make sure that what he was doing was legal or legitimate. So he went to see an attorney instead of going to just, you know, somewhere else. And plus, you know, he does not speak English. He wanted to make sure that what he does was not violating any laws. That was the

purpose he went to see an attorney. And the attorney didn't advise him what he was doing or what he was helping the people in China to look for someone here is illegal.

MR. HEEREN: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Again, just, Mr. Tung, please try to stick to the evidence as opposed to what didn't happen or they didn't hear about. Remember? Focus on the evidence in the trial.

MR. TUNG: Well, this is an argument, Your Honor. Because why people looking for an attorney?

THE COURT: No, Mr. Tung, don't argue with me. Just continue. Just be careful. Focus on the evidence and what you would say is perhaps the insufficiency of that evidence or what it shows or doesn't show.

MR. TUNG: And for whatever the reason, we do not know. It's up to the government to present why -- there is a reason -- I mean, whatever the reason, we do not know. Yong Zhu did not sign this retainer agreement. But Mr. Yong Zhu found an interpreter, Chinese interpreter, to assist him to communicate with the Private Detective McMahon that was located for him by Attorney Shi.

I would like to show you Government's Exhibit 0901-D, and I put up there.

Now, when you have a chance to go back to the room to deliberate, please take a look at this document, this

Summation - Mr. Tung 2077

document, Government's Exhibit 0901-D. It is a WeChat communications, right? It's a WeChat communications between, by the name of Wang Xin Middleman and I believe the other person is the interpreter.

Ladies and gentlemen, please take note, look at it, the e-mail of the WeChat communications. Yong Zhu, in this WeChat communication, and he used an alias name, Wang Xin, the middleman. Now, most people when they sign on WeChat, they will use an alias names instead of using their real names. Most people would do that.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Stick to the evidence.

MR. TUNG: Now, look at this. He, Mr. Yong Zhu, is calling himself a middleman. What is a middleman? Middleman is someone who introduce someone to somebody else. He's in the middle. That's what a middleman. Doing the business transaction, he introduce Party A to Party B and he's acting as a middleman. That's what Yong Zhu is talking about. I mean, he's defining his role in this transaction.

Now, if you go through all of those WeChat communications, you will notice there's none, no communications and no mentioning of Chinese government at all. The job they're talking about between try to get the -- try to nail down the contract, the retainer agreement between McMahon and Yong Zhu are his Chinese contacts. If you go -- I don't

```
Case 1:21-cr-00265-PKC Document 302 Filed 08/30/24 Page 146 of 219 PageID #:
                           Summation - Mr. Tung
                                                              2078
 1
     want to go through because of time. It's up. But if you go
 2
      through this exhibit. And the other person, interpreter
 3
      service is also, you notice from other displays, other
 4
      communications, is called Transperfect Languages Service.
 5
                I'm going to show you another government's exhibit,
 6
      3009.
 7
                THE COURT: Is that admitted?
 8
                Hold on.
 9
                MR. HEEREN: Your Honor, can we just take down this
10
      version?
               It's unredacted.
11
                THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: It's off.
12
                THE COURT: So is there a redacted version that
13
      someone can provide to Mr. Tung?
14
                MR. HEEREN: Yes, we can.
15
                THE COURT: Okay.
16
                MR. HEEREN: What number, Mr. Tung?
17
                MR. TUNG: 3009.
18
                THE COURT: Do you just want to put it on the
19
      screen?
20
                MR. HEEREN: We're ready, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much,
21
22
     Government.
23
                THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you have your double
24
     screen on?
25
                Oh, there you go.
```

| Case 1:21-cr-00265-PKC |  |  |
|------------------------|--|--|
|                        | 5073<br>Summation - Mr. Tung 2079                              |  |
| 1                      | MR. HEEREN: One second. She's fixing it.                       |  |
| 2                      | (Pause in proceedings.)  |  |
| 3                      | THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Good?                                    |  |
| 4                      | MR. HEEREN: Yes. Thank you.                                    |  |
| 5                      | MR. TUNG: That is the retainer agreement signed                |  |
| 6                      | between Yong Zhu and Detective McMahon. All I pointed out to   |  |
| 7                      | you, if when you go back to the deliberations room, there's no |  |
| 8                      | mentioning whatsoever that work was being asked by the Chinese |  |
| 9                      | government. And the reason Mr. Yong Zhu signed these           |  |
| 10                     | retainers on behalf of his Chinese contact, it could be the    |  |
| 11                     | Chinese contact in China, when you have a retainer, you cannot |  |
| 12                     | sign physically.   |  |
| 13                     | MR. HEEREN: Objection, Your Honor.                             |  |
| 14                     | THE COURT: Overruled.  |  |
| 15                     | Again, this is argument. You're asking them to make            |  |
| 16                     | that inference.  |  |
| 17                     | Go ahead.  |  |
| 18                     | MR. TUNG: Now I am going to show you Government                |  |
| 19                     | Exhibit 3007.  |  |
| 20                     |  |  |
| 21                     | (Continued on the next page.)                                  |  |
| 22                     |  |  |
| 23                     |  |  |
| 24                     |  |  |
| 25                     |  |  |

| 1  | MR. TUNG: (Continuing.) This exhibit shows the                 |
|----|--|
| 2  | communication between Emily Hsu. Emily Hsu is also known as    |
| 3  | Lina Xu, and she was the interpreter and she was hired by      |
| 4  | Yong Zhu to assist him to communicate with Mike McMahon.       |
| 5  | Now, on the last page of this email, and that is               |
| 6  | Government Exhibit 307, on the last page of this email, there  |
| 7  | was an email sent by Detective McMahon and asking for the      |
| 8  | information, the name of the person, the subject target, phone |
| 9  | number, etc., and  |
| 10 | THE COURT: It wasn't focused, Mr. Tung, in and out             |
| 11 | of focus. Just give it a second. There you go.                 |
| 12 | Now, ladies and gentlemen, if a detective or private           |
| 13 | investigator was hired to do the job to locate someone, what   |
| 14 | are the normal information he would like to get, a person's    |
| 15 | name, address, or something, whatever the information you have |
| 16 | that might help him to start look, and there's nothing wrong   |
| 17 | with this. It's normal business between McMahon and Yong Zhu   |
| 18 | at that time.  |
| 19 | So and I'm going to show you the exhibit                       |
| 20 | MR. HEERAN: Your Honor, that's un-redacted, as                 |
| 21 | well.  |
| 22 | MR. TUNG: 3013.  |
| 23 | Ladies and gentlemen, this is the information that             |
| 24 | Yong Zhu through his interpreter provided to private           |
| 25 | investigator McMahon so he can start to work on the job. Now,  |

SUMMATION - TUNG

2081

1 you know that Ms. Yong Zhu does not speak English so data 2 compiled here is most likely done by Emily Hsu and she was working for Yong Zhu. What the government says that's where 3 Ms. Yong Zhu's involvement as part of this conspiracy, right, 4 5 provides the information to the Detective McMahon. Ms. Yong Zhu here -- Mr. Yong Zhu here is actually 6 7 getting the information from his China contact, Chinese 8 contact and passing along to Detective McMahon. Now, remember 9 I showed you before in the reach of communication, in 10 Yong Zhu's mind, he is -- he was the middleman. So most the time, as the middleman, you'll understand, in the business, in 11 12 any business transactions, you're the one to let your party B 13 to know who party A is. Otherwise, what is your -- what's the 14 point of being a middleman. They will cut you off, right? 15 They'll deal directly with each other. So as a middleman, that's the only reason 16 17 Mr. Yong Zhu still communicate with Mike McMahon to give him the information and pass it on, the feedback, you know, from 18 19 McMahon, what the Chinese contact wants. That's how -- those 20 communications between October 5 and October 27, 2016 for that period of time. At the very beginning period of time, you'll 21 22 see these in the evidence, they have been communicating, 23 communicating with each other. 24 Of course, now, the middleman, he wanted to get 25

If they know each other, he not going to get paid and

SUMMATION - TUNG

2082

1 you have seen now he was cut out after he introduced Eric Yan, 2 Hu Ji, a -- later, we know that he's a Chinese contact, 3 official from China, to Detective McMahon as when they falsely met at Panera Bread restaurant in New Jersey. That was the 4 5 point in time he was cut out, and I'm going to show you the picture, the famous picture of three, that's 6 7 Government Exhibit 0902-F. And you have seen this famous picture many, many times, but my argument for my crime is 8 9 was -- is after this date, after they met, there was no more 10 communications between Yong Zhu and -- at the very beginning shortly thereafter, sporadic communications, but then that 11 12 decreases, as I will show you now in the next exhibit. 13 The next exhibit is Government Exhibit 0316. In the 14 left upper corner, these are the -- this is a voice call 15 analysis produced by the government and they had an expert, a 16 lady who testified what the communication is -- was. Now, the 17 summary charts recorded phone calls from September 2016 18 through December 2016. If you look at these, Yong Zhu's 19 involvement -- okay, there are still some communications --20 the first one, I found Yong Zhu on that list that call between Yong Zhu and Hu Ji, that's on October 26, 2016, that's a day 21 22 before the three men met at the Panera Bread restaurant, and 23 the next time is October 27, 2016, Yong Zhu and Hu Ji talked 24 on that date for about 15 minutes. The two calls added 25 together.

SUMMATION - TUNG

Going through. On October 27, 2016, that's the day where the three met at the restaurant, Hu Ji and Yong Zhu had a communication. And then the next one I can identify on this table is October 28, 2016, Hu Ji and Yong Zhu had about point-three seconds communication. I do not know what it is, it could be a messaging. And thereafter, you'll see this — throughout this, the rest of the entries which ended on December 29, 2016, no communications between Hu Ji and Yong Zhu. So, clearly, after the three met in the restaurant, Yong Zhu was terminated or eliminated.

So — now, I'm going to show you the next exhibit

which is Government Exhibit 0317. Now, this is a continuation of a voice call, monitoring voice call for the data -- for the period April 5, 2017, through April 12, 2017, and you noticed on the left corner, Yong Zhu is not even the number listed there to be monitored. And if you go through all those six pages, there's no phone calls from anybody, from anybody, to Yong Zhu or Yong Zhu called anyone else on this chart.

April 5th through 12th, that's where people from China, Liu Yan and his -- and her crew from China came over to the United States before they left the United States. So this clearly indicates in April 2017, Yong Zhu, at that time, was already out of this circle, he had no business, whatsoever, with him.

And that's why I would call this date the date they

SUMMATION - TUNG

2084

1 met. October 27, 2016, is the date for them to get rid of 2 Yong Zhu. Now -- so, in other words, Yong Zhu's involvement 3 was only started from October 5th through October 27, 2016, at 4 very beginning, at the outset, and he helped the Chinese 5 contact to find, through the attorney, to find the detective 6 Michael McMahon and then he kind of signed a retainer 7 agreement on behalf of the Chinese contact. He didn't pay the money. The money was paid -- I mean paid by -- that money was 8 9 paid -- somebody is paying the detective and the interpreter. 10 Now, then his service was terminated. What he did, you have heard, you have seen some of 11 12 the evidence, what he did was he went to the airport to pick 13 up Eric Yan, or Hu Ji. He provided -- no, before they meet, 14 right, he provided service to drive them from the airport to 15 hotel and driving around for three days and he was compensated 16 \$600 -- \$200 a day for providing transportation service. 17 Remember the government showed post-arrest video recording of Yong Zhu when he was interviewed by FBI agents in 18 19 a small room, and I am not -- I know the government will say 20 objection, but I say, before they say objection, I'm not trying to -- trying to make a point that he was not given 21 22 Miranda rights until --MR. HEERAN: Objection, Your Honor. 23 24 THE COURT: Sustained. If I sustain the objection, 25 you can't go into that again, remember?

That was Yong Zhu's answer when he was asked by FBI Agent Bruno whether or not he knows Hu Ji is government agent -- government representative of China.

21

22

23

24

25

And, ladies and gentlemen, I urge you, when you go back to the room to deliberate, if you want to see the actual video, you can see it. It's only very short video. It's a

SUMMATION - TUNG

1 very short video.

Now, the point what I was making is, when he give that answer, nobody was helping him, right, nobody guiding him, give him hint how you can answer the government's question, FBI's question. He answered this spontaneously, naturally. That was at a time he was arrested, right? So he gave that answer. It kind of substantiates or it is kind of his position from beginning toward now that he didn't know that he — his Chinese contact was from the Chinese government.

THE COURT: Did you say he didn't know?

MR. TUNG: He didn't know.

THE COURT: Okay. Just so the record's clear.

MR. TUNG: Sorry.

THE COURT: No, no, it's okay.

MR. TUNG: So, if I go back to that telephone traffic charts, the charts clearly present compelling -- presents compelling evidence that highlights the diminishing role of Yong Zhu as the middleman following their meeting between the Chinese contact Hu Ji or Eric Yan and the private investigator Michael McMahon on October 27, 2016. The chart demonstrates that the frequency of the phone calls involving Yong Zhu with Hu Ji significantly decrease with only sporadic communications between -- I mean, occurring a few times in October 2016 and thereafter. Starting from November,

SUMMATION - TUNG

December, there's no phone calls there.

And then in the chart for the 2017, it reveals a complete absence of calls between -- I'm sorry, between Yong Zhu and his Chinese contact, a private investigator, through the interpreter. And this clearly indicates that Yong Zhu was never considered by the Chinese contact -- by his Chinese contact as an integral part of their alleged plan or scheme of the so-called operation Foxhound program. He was just present there, introduced his Chinese contact to the private investigator he found for the Chinese contact.

I remember at the opening, the government said, but for Yong Zhu's initial contact, right, to introduce to the detective, right, this entire thing wouldn't happen, but for Yong Zhu's involvement to introduce someone to Detective McMahon, so then the rest of those things started, but, ladies and gentlemen, I'm asking you to think a -- just a very common sense question, if a killer of many victims, right, it there's a massacre killing, okay, do we hold the mother of that killer simply -- I'm not saying anything else, simply for the reason that she gave the birth to that killer to be liable for the victims or victims' families? Do we?

No, this is too remote, right?

If someone -- this is similar to a situation here.

Yong Zhu only introduced the Chinese contact to

Detective McMahon. Whatever happens after that, right, he has

SUMMATION - TUNG

2089

1 no involvement. Even if he wanted to, they don't even want 2 him. We can't hold Yong Zhu to be liable for all these 3 subsequent consequences or events. Just like I said, a mother 4 gave birth to the killer, if the killer later, when he grows 5 up, right, kills so many people, we cannot blame on the mother just for the fact that she gave birth to the killer. It's a 6 7 similar situation here. 8 And, ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to pay 9 attention to all the evidence presented by the government. 10 Have you seen any evidence that the -- his Chinese contact Hu Ji or Eric Yan, before he came to the United States or 11 12 after he came to the United States, giving Yong Zhu anything 13 to identify himself as a Chinese official such as a business 14 card or anything? Have we seen any of these evidence here? 15 It is upon the Government's burden to prove that Yong Zhu knew 16 that the Eric Yan or Hu Ji was a Chinese Government 17 representative. We have not seen any of those evidence here. Therefore, Yong Zhu did not know the real identity of 18 19 Eric Yan, of Hu Ji, or his true intention to come to the 20 United States to locate a person for the purpose to re-patron 21 them back to China. They always had the belief it was just to 22 grab a private detective. Now, I would like to show Government Exhibit 4012. 23

It's a comprehensive report generated by Mike McMahon.

MR. HEERAN: We can put that on our screen.

24

25

SUMMATION - TUNG

THE COURT: All right. I presume it contains some redactions?

MR. HEERAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, go ahead. You're supposed to be using the redacted versions. There we go, okay.

MR. TUNG: That's fine. Thank you.

On the second page, second or third page, I think third page, there's a box here, there's a shaded box here, right, that's -- okay. This box says, right, INTERPOL most wanted and then the name of Shi Zheng Zhu. And this was the very first time Private Investigator Mike McMahon found, he found, he generated this report, and he sends this report to the interpreter who is talking to -- who is supposed to help Yong Zhu, and the date of this report is October 5, 2016.

So the government's position is, here we go, he should have known this guy is most -- is wanted by the Chinese government, right, so he must be -- you know, whatever the work you're getting, must be related to Chinese government work. But this doesn't really make any sense here, ladies and gentlemen.

What the evidence so far shows, Detective McMahon was getting an order, right, from Yong Zhu for Xu Jin why you from the Chinese contact, he was supposed to locate a person for the company. Now, when he ran a background check, it just pops out that person just happens to be a person who is also

PROCEEDINGS

2091

1 wanted by the INTERPOL. There is a big difference here. 2 big difference is he was not told to find someone who is 3 wanted by INTERPOL. He just accidently runs a background 4 check just like over here we're doing background check all the 5 time, and it turns out to be that person has a criminal 6 background -- a criminal history. 7 So this is a coincidence. This does not prove that 8 government -- government presented evidence does not prove 9 that the -- either Detective McMahon or Mr. Yong Zhu was aware 10 or became aware that the -- on October 5, 2016, this work they're getting from Chinese contact was for government work. 11 12 THE COURT: Mr. Tung, I'm not sure how much longer 13 you're going to go but I did want to tell you we're going to 14 take a break at 4:15. Because since obviously the jury's been 15 here for the last couple of hours since lunch and I want to 16 give them a break. 17 MR. TUNG: Sure. I have another 15 minutes. So can 18 we just take a break now? 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 Let's take our break now, ladies and gentlemen. 21 Don't talk about the case, keep an open mind, don't do any 22 research, just relax for the next 15 minutes. And remember we have Mr. Tung's conclusion and then the government will do a 23 24 rebuttal.

25

```
PROCEEDINGS
                                                  2092
             (Jury exits the courtroom.)
 1
             THE COURT: Everyone else, you have roughly 15
 2
    minutes, a little longer. We'll start again at 4:30.
 3
             (A brief recess was taken.)
 4
 5
             (Continued on the following page.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

| Case 1 | :21-cr-00265-PKC Document 302 Filed 08/30/24 Page 161 of 219 PageID #: |
|--------|--|
|        | <b>5087</b><br>SUMMATION - MR. TUNG 2093                               |
| 1      | (Continuing.)  |
| 2      | THE COURT: Okay. So we're going to get everyone                        |
| 3      | back in the room, Mr. Tung.  |
| 4      | THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.  |
| 5      | (Jury enters the courtroom.)   |
| 6      | THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone. Mr. Tung,                       |
| 7      | you may resume your argument.  |
| 8      | MR. TUNG: Thank you, Your Honor.                                       |
| 9      | Have a good break?   |
| 10     | Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to show you one more                    |
| 11     | time I know you have seen this exhibit many many times, but            |
| 12     | this is a very crucial one, and I'd like to show you                   |
| 13     | Government Exhibit 4019B.  |
| 14     | THE COURT: Is that okay to display?                                    |
| 15     | MR. HEEREN: That's fine, Your Honor. Yes.                              |
| 16     | THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.   |
| 17     | MR. TUNG: Maybe I just read it out, what's on that                     |
| 18     | exhibit. You know this already, because I cannot this is               |
| 19     | the communications between Private Investigator McMahon and            |
| 20     | with his fellow investigator Eric Gallowitz.                           |
| 21     | On October 5th, 2016, when Detective McMahon                           |
| 22     | discover that was the target was wanted by INTERPOL, he sent           |
| 23     | some messages to his fellow detective. PLO says, he wanted by          |
| 24     | INTERPOL, wow. And then the next page, he ask, he caution              |
| 25     | his Eric Gallowitz, bring your gun. And remember yesterday             |

SUMMATION - MR. TUNG

you heard Eric Gallowitz testify and he kind of joke, you taking care of self, I will bring my gun.

Now, the reason I'm showing you this document because this is actually -- you see the response from Detective McMahon. Wow, when you find something. So this clearly, it supports my argument on October 5th, that was the first time they discover, that was coincidence, it was never told by the Chinese Government the target you're looking for is wanted by the Chinese Government.

I'd like to show you Government Exhibit 4004.

MR. HEEREN: That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. You can publish.

MR. TUNG: This is the communications between the interpreter and Private Investigator McMahon when they talking about how to nail the contract between them. I like to ask you when go back to the deliberation room, to look at the page. I don't know the page number, but look at the page which I'm showing you now -- you have seen this before.

McMahon was telling -- was asking, was communicating with the

interpreter. I'm sure he used this, but he didn't tell us. I think he should have. He wanted for corruption, embezzlement, and taking bribes.

Okay. Now, this communication -- and actually, there was a previous question, yes. Okay. Would you think it will be okay to share this information with Mr. Zhu or should

SUMMATION - MR. TUNG

I not to pass this information to him. That was the interpreter talking and Detective McMahon just answered, I'm sure he knows this, but he didn't tell us.

Now, the reason I'm showing you this document is I would like to tell you clearly you see first -- and let me still have this displayed up there. The interpreter was asking the detective, should I tell Mr. Yong Zhu because that's her client who was asking her to do translations, and then the detective says, well, I think you knew about it. But my argument to you is, if Mr. Yong Zhu would know that the target was most wanted by INTERPOL or the Chinese Government, there's no reason he didn't want to tell them, tell the detective.

And the other point I would like to point it out is when the interpreter was asking the Detective McMahon, should I tell Mr. Yong Zhu about this, now, have you seen any evidence throughout all these communications between the interpreter and the detective, Private Detective McMahon? All these communications was not directly between McMahon and Yong Zhu. Have the Government met their burden to prove Defendant Yong Zhu was told by the interpreter all these communications. Obviously, you know, the interpreter was not called as a witness here. So if there was a gap here, I submit to you that raises issue of beyond reasonable doubt. The Government has to prove that Yong Zhu was told about this.

SUMMATION - MR. TUNG 1 Nothing. Is just an assumption. The interpreter would 2 automatically to tell Yong Zhu was transpiring in all these messages exchange between the interpreter and the detective. 3 So that's why I'm saying, Yong Zhu has no burden to prove 4 5 anything. Government has not proved that Yong Zhu was made aware of that, at least on October 5th, 2016. 6 7 Remember, I said earlier Mr. Yong Zhu went to see an 8 attorney. If he knew if the Chinese contact, right, told him 9 already that the target was INTERPOL, I think he would have 10 revealed that to the attorney. Why did he pay money, a consultation fee to an attorney without telling her the truth? 11 12 So he was getting all these responses which is misguided, 13 right. Because, you know, attorneys communication with 14 attorney is attorney-client privilege, covered. He wouldn't 15 have to worry about --MR. HEEREN: Objection, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Overruled. 17 18 Again, ladies and gentlemen, this is just an 19 argument. 20 MR. TUNG: Yong Zhu should have known that when he consulted an attorney, his communication with Attorney Shi, 21 22 nobody can look at this, even Government cannot look at this. 23 So it is no reason he is not going to tell the people in this 24 chain, Attorney Shi, the interpreter, and McMahon at that 25 time, you know, when they -- when Mr. Yong Zhu tried to help

SUMMATION - MR. TUNG 2097 1 the Chinese contact to find the private detective. 2 point is, this is for everybody, including Private Detective 3 McMahon, in October 2016, nobody, nobody, knows that the job was ask them to do to find someone is from Chinese Government. 4 5 Now, ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to do a 6 comparison. You have seen -- I'm going to show a 7 communications between Johnny Zhu and Allen Jin, which is Government's -- both of them -- not both of them, I'm sorry. 8 9 Allen Jin real name is Jin Hongru. He took the stand to 10 testify, and I'm going to show the exhibit here so you see the comparison here. What I'm showing you now is Government 11 12 Exhibit 0807F. 13 Thank you for your help. Finally Government helps. What is being shown is the messages and 14 15 communications between Government witness. What's his real 16 name? I forgot. Jin and Johnny Zhu. Now, this is a 17 situation that I'm going to show you -- look at the page, I'm going to show you now, is April 1st, 2017, Johnny Zhu was 18 19 talking to Allen Jin. And look at this, where I'm pointing 20 to. Correct. Just follow the instructions when working 21 22 for the Chinese Government. It will be just fine by playing 23 dumb and not asking questions. I will make the arrangements. 24 Now, this is just one lowly example. Remember, the 25 witness testified, right, that witness testified, he knew

SUMMATION - MR. TUNG

1 exactly he was working for Chinese Government.

And also, I'm going to show you Government's

Exhibit 0812C. And also, on the same day, right, April 1st,

2017. I mean, look at this, the compensation is 1800 U.S.

dollars. So the point I'm making here is, if someone is, was
recruited by the Chinese Government or through a intermediate
person, what's that person, Allen -- Johnny Zhu, they would be
told explicitly, you're working for the Chinese Government.

This is what you're going to be paid for. Then you compare to
the situations applying to Mr. Yong Zhu. Has the Government
presented any evidence such as even casual communications
between the Chinese contact and the Yong Zhu, anything like
this can be referenced to that was the job given by the
Chinese Government? The answer is no.

Have you found any evidence that it was any communications between the Chinese Government, Eric Yan, Hu Ji, with similar communications with Detective McMahon? The answer is no. So that's a clear comparison. When you see this, if you are recruited by the Chinese Government, you have evidence here. If Government cannot prove, cannot produce any of those evidence, they cannot present any of those evidence, that means there is a serious question of beyond a reasonable doubt to hold my client liable for.

In addition, even though attorney for Paul Goldberger has repeatedly stated, but I'm saying for my

SUMMATION - MR. TUNG

2099

1 client, I just want to bring your attention to the event for 2 Zheng here. You heard the testimony when Paul asked --Mr. Goldberger asked, right, where did you get this job, 3 4 right? It was from California by the person Chen Chaohong 5 called and he said it was from a dai lo. Actually, dai lo is -- that's slang. What that meant is a mafia family to do 6 7 kind of debt collections and things of that sort, right. 8 if a job is given by Chinese Government, it will be clearly 9 spelled out. Under that circumstances, it was not spelled 10 out. It was just people referring to dai lo in China. So when you do all comparisons with all defendants, 11 12 right, the defendants who took the stand, they pleaded guilty 13 because they are guilty. They work for Chinese Government. That's why he had to plead guilty, that he worked as an agent 14 15 for the Chinese Government. 16 And the people, three people here, sit here, the 17 Government has not presented evidence sufficient to 18 convince -- at least convince me, and I hope, you know, they 19 have not convinced you either. 20 What I'm showing you know is another exhibit of Government Exhibit 0402U. 21 22 THE COURT: Is the Government fine with this being 23 publicly displayed, 402U? 24 MR. HEEREN: Yes. It's fine, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUMMATION - MR. TUNG

2100

MR. TUNG: Now, ladies and gentlemen, this is a document generated by U.S. Customs and Border Protections which list all the international travels by my client, Mr. Yong Zhu. And you look at those yellow line area. Between 2017 and all the way up to 2019, Mr. Yong Zhu has gone back and forth to China many many times. Remember, the question is -- remember when, on or about April 7, 2017, when Tu Lan for some reason, they kind of noticed their functions here, whatever they doing here was kind of being watched by somebody, maybe FBI, so she wasn't supposed to leave April 12th, right. Five days earlier, she book the flight, she left, and she notified, right, with all these e-mail communications, notified Johnny Zhu, you got to leave, right. Something like this. This is going to be dangerous now. Somebody kind of knows. So Johnny Zhu left on April 12, 2017 too, and they never came back here. These are the real criminals. Now, look at If Yong Zhu did consider a major player in that circle, do you think they wouldn't have to notify him? please leave with us, don't ever come back to the United States, you'll be caught, you'll be charged, you'll be convicted here, you'll go to jail here. No. And look at how many trips Yong Zhu made to go to China between entering there and coming back, for whatever reason. It could be for family reasons, We do not know. But it could be many reasons, right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUMMATION - MR. TUNG

2101

Nobody ever, from Chinese Government, obviously, I can argue, could infer from the facts, they warned him, right. Don't go back to U.S. because you may be caught. You maybe prosecuted. Okay.

Earlier today, Government showed evidence, a picture -- I don't have it. I just mention the fact that they showed a chart showing that in May of 2018, that they say Yong Zhu, before he booked a flight to China, he went to 315, the sister Feng Liu's house in Short Hill to take two pictures. And Government's position or their argument saying that this is the -- this is the fact, that Yong Zhu continued to do surveillance at the premises. I am asking -- I mean, yes, the Government can say, you can infer from some facts. Inference, you still have to have some background, right. You cannot just infer from a fact like this. Now, I can infer from the facts, I can give you 10 different, even more, different possibilities with this fact. The Government has got to prove that Yong Zhu went to the premises on May 13, 2018, to commit a crime. What they just showed, he booked a flight to China. I just showed you a traveling record. Mr. Yong Zhu went to China all the time, back and forth, back and forth. Why the Government would say this time in 2018 he went back to China because he went -- I mean, five days before, he went to take a picture of Short Hill address? There is nothing there. They just want to ask you to infer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUMMATION - MR. TUNG 2102

From where? I'm actually -- I'm arguing here, what he did, I now can argue is this clearly shows he was already out of this loop. Everybody here know, everybody in this room know by now, Short Hill house was no longer an interest for Chinese Government for anyone here, because Xu Jin is not living there. Once his real house in Warren was discovered, who cares about the sister's house? So why? You know, the question, I cannot answer because I don't have to answer. The Government has to give more, such as, like, they captured all these communications between those defendants. They got to show more. Mr. Yong Zhu, such as, received instructions from Chinese Government, please go to -- in 2018, right -- to please go to Short Hill property to take some pictures for us. Did you see any evidence like this? No. Right. So why Mr. Yong Zhu went there to take pictures? Could be for many many reasons. Another reason, I can give to you, he was consider himself a middleman. He wasn't paid for what he introducing Mr. McMahon to them. So maybe he was wanted to take some pictures to go back to China to argue with them, how come I don't get paid? These are just millions and millions of possibilities there, ladies and gentlemen. Yong Zhu doesn't have a burden to prove. I submit to you, Government present this evidence, shows nothing, nothing more than a speculation. And remember this morning, the Government, in their

SUMMATION - MR. TUNG

2103

1 argument, they say in the -- they show a document which says 2 Yong Zhu says that was the interpreter talking to McMahon. Yong Zhu was talking about the target owed him a lot of money. 3 4 I do not know if you still remember that. I don't have the 5 evidence here because they have it. I wasn't prepared because that's something they brought in this morning. So I don't 6 7 have the slides here. Now, he said -- she said, it's a lie, it's a lie, 8 9 it's a lie, because the target does not owe money to Yong Zhu. 10 But my question here is, wait a minute, Government, did you show proof that was the communications, conversations between 11 the translator and somebody else, right? Something's missing 12 13 here. Government got to show Yong Zhu sent to anybody, 14 Yong Zhu made that statement. Then Government can say, this 15 is a lie. I mean, the target does not owe you money, the 16 target owes the Chinese Government or company, money. 17 that's why when Government presents evidence, they got to prove, you know, with something beyond reasonable doubt. 18 They 19 kind of throwing those facts here and making you, the jury, to sorting out, then with all these confusions and with thousands 20 21 of pages of these documents. How could you determine, right? They got to give you a -- this case is not so complicated. 22 23 they have sufficient evidence, it should be very 24 straightforward, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, to arrive at their 25 conclusion. Have we seen them here? No. The answer is no.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUMMATION - MR. TUNG

2105

Eric Yan, Hui Sun, Tu Lan, was Government officials, and while these Chinese Government officials never disclosed themselves to them, we are from China, we are here to do a Government job. It's not fair to place that burden on these three defendants here to figure that out.

Now, remember we ask questions for the professor. Forty years of experience with Chinese Government structures. I'm asking you a question. How many people here in this courtroom understanding the complex Chinese Government systems with CCP, with Chinese Government, ruling parties? These are the things I have heard for the first times. I learned something. Yes, I respect the professor. But you ask these people to understand, to figure all this out in October of 2016? Come on. Our Government, you have heard testimony, professor, even an expert in Chinese affairs, all these Government affairs, he has rarely seen any Government warnings by the United States, right, to warn its people that, please be alert, foreign intelligence, foreign Government may use you as a pawn to carry out their missions here in the United States. Please watch out. How many people have here heard of this? Yes, we have heard, there's a war going on in somewhere, please let's evacuate, and the Government gives warnings, let's United States citizens, I will give you warning, please evacuate from that country. But there's no similar warnings whatsoever was given. It is very easily for

SUMMATION - MR. TUNG

2106

1 ordinary Americans, naive Americans, to walk into this complex 2 web of those deceptions, all of these things here. And they are already in bad shape to figure this all out, what I'm 3 4 getting into this. 5 I do not blame Detective McMahon. He has to make a 6 That's his business. And Mr. Yong Zhu, he doesn't 7 have a job. He's running odd job. He basically got to 8 somebody else that say, if you go to U.S., to find someone for 9 me, and he thought there was nothing wrong with this. 10 any warnings, sufficient warnings surrounding, people do not become so alerted. Ladies and gentlemen, that's why I'm 11 12 asking you to think about this now. They are also victims. 13 They are used. They're used by a very sophisticated 14 Government. People are using them. Government -- Chinese 15 Government, they are use them. They never told them. 16 never give them the business card. They told them to go for 17 finding a private debt collection, right. So all of this, I'm 18 feel very sympathetic to them --19 THE COURT: Mr. Tung, be careful. 20 Your sympathy is irrelevant to the jury. I'm going to finish up, okay. 21 MR. TUNG: I know. Very quick. One more sentence. I'm going to end this. 22 23 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, the fate of 24 Mr. Yong Zhu rests at your hands. They are helpless. Look at 25 They were used, cheated, misquided by foreign

| Case 1:21-cr-00265-PKC |   |  |
|------------------------|---|--|
|                        | 5101<br>SUMMATION - MR. TUNG 2107                             |  |
| 1                      | Government to work for them. They unknowing, unknowingly did  |  |
| 2                      | something for the foreign Government. We did not deny, like   |  |
| 3                      | Mr. Lusterberg said, we did not deny what they did, but they  |  |
| 4                      | unknowingly did it, and instead, our Government didn't help   |  |
| 5                      | them. Prosecuted them here. The only person in this room can  |  |
| 6                      | help them is you. I sincerely ask you to look at evidence.    |  |
| 7                      | You don't have to look at thousands of evidence. I kind of    |  |
| 8                      | give you summary of these evidence. These are crucial         |  |
| 9                      | evidence that I think can clear my client's name and return a |  |
| 10                     | favorable verdict in my client, Yong Zhu.                     |  |
| 11                     | Thank you very much for listening to my talking               |  |
| 12                     | today.  |  |
| 13                     | THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Tung.                               |  |
| 14                     | Mr. Heeren, why don't you start your rebuttal,                |  |
| 15                     | understanding that we're going to stop at 5:30.               |  |
| 16                     | MR. HEEREN: Yes, Your Honor.                                  |  |
| 17                     | THE COURT: Okay. Do you need to set up anything?              |  |
| 18                     | MR. HEEREN: Yes, I do need a moment.                          |  |
| 19                     | THE COURT: Okay. Just take a second.                          |  |
| 20                     | Do you need the mic, Mr. Heeren?                              |  |
| 21                     | MR. HEEREN: I do, yes.  |  |
| 22                     |   |  |
| 23                     | (Continued on the following page.)                            |  |
| 24                     |   |  |
| 25                     |   |  |

Rebuttal Summation - Mr. Heeren 2109

1 when they made the choice, and it was a choice, to go out and

2 harass and intimidate these people, knowing they were doing so

3 for the Chinese government. One of them was previously

4 responsible for investigating and upholding the law and

5 | counsel spent some time pointing that out, but that just shows

that he knew even better than most that the choices he made

7 was both illegal and wrong.

Now, I'm not going to respond to all of the arguments made by each of the three defendants. I'm going to clarify some of the key points that I submit you should be focusing on when you deliberate. Because we saw that you paid close attention during this trial and you've seen and heard all the evidence. And most importantly, when you go back into that jury room, you bring with you something critical, which is your common sense. You can bring that with you and you should rely on that. And because of your careful attention, your review of the evidence and your use of common sense, we know that it will lead you to the only conclusion that is supported by the evidence, that all three of these defendants are guilty as charged.

Now, I want to start looking at all three defendants together. There has been some discussion about a lack of direct evidence, there's no evidence, not a shred of evidence, lots of talk about that there hasn't been any evidence over the past two weeks. I submit to you that's not correct.

own words.

Rebuttal Summation - Mr. Heeren

There's a substantial amount of evidence, both circumstantial and direct evidence. Each of these three defendants knew what they were doing and the overall goal of the criminal scheme that they participated in. You know not just from what they claim is circumstantial evidence, but you know that from their

Jason Zhu admitted clearly and unambiguously that he knew the person he was working with, Hu Ji, worked for the Chinese government and that their plan was to locate the victims to return them to China. Go listen to it. We encourage you to listen to all these postarrest statements, too. After he made that admission, he tried to backtrack and said: Well, all those things I said about the Overseas Chinese Affairs Committee and the departments who are all working together with reward, I -- I don't know; you're right, I don't know. But listen to what he said before "I don't know." He knew they were Chinese government officials and he knew the scheme, the overall objective was to return this person against their will to go back to China.

Go listen to Michael McMahon's statement after he was arrested. He admitted to two key facts. He knew that the people who hired him wanted to get Xu Jin to return to China so that they could prosecute him. There was no ambiguity in that statement. He was not confused by the words that he used. He used the words "prosecute him." His friend Eric

Rebuttal Summation - Mr. Heeren

Gallowitz completely understood the words "prosecute" when it was used, another fellow NYPD officer. Mr. McMahon knows what "prosecute" is. He knew that. He knew this was a government criminal operation.

And importantly, after suggesting it might be a typo, Mr. McMahon admitted that he had suggested he personally proposed to harass the victims. And he went and explained it. He said, you know, sit outside the house, they'll know you're there, and then maybe they'll turn themselves in. Go listen to it again. You don't turn yourselves in if you're in the middle of a civil litigation. You turn yourself in if you think they're trying to arrest somebody.

And Congying Zheng, his expression of his understanding of the conspiracy is found in the written document that he saw, that his counsel admits he saw. And then seeing that document, seeing that he had a note in his hand that said return to China and then your family will be safe if you spend time in prison in China, then he posted it. He knew what this was about when he did it. And you can infer his knowledge further when he was questioned about it and lied. There was a lot of discussion about Mr. Kuang's lies, but go watch the postarrest statement by Zheng. Lied. "I just drove him. I had nothing to do with the note. I didn't even know about the note." Why did he lie when he was arrested? Because he knew what he did was wrong and a crime.

5106

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Rebuttal Summation - Mr. Heeren

2112

The defendants have suggested this was all happenstance; at best, different conspiracies. That's The reason why all three of these defendants have inaccurate. all essentially said the same thing, the reason why they were all directed to do essentially the same thing in different ways is because they all participated in the same criminal conspiracy. It does not matter -- and you're going to hear more of this when you hear from the Court about conspiracy law. It does not matter that some of the defendants didn't know each other or didn't know the same people who gave them their immediate directions. These messages can get passed down through people. What matters is that they have the same goal, the same unifying objective throughout. And that was clear, they did. The question is whether they were working to further one common unlawful design or purpose. I expect that's a phrase you'll hear. And if so, then a single criminal conspiracy exists. And that is, in fact, the case here. Now, I want to spend some time talking about each of the individual defendant's arguments. I want to start with Mr. Zheng. And I suppose I should start with the point that, as my colleague pointed out, Mr. Zheng is charged with four offenses: Two conspiracies and two substantive offenses. And counsel for Mr. Zheng spent a lot of time talking about conspiracy and withdrawal from the conspiracy and he spent no

Rebuttal Summation - Mr. Heeren

real time talking about the substantive offense. And there's
a reason for that. And that is because this claim of
withdrawal, which is without merit, and I'll get to that, but
this claim of withdrawal only relates to conspiracy. It does
not act as a defense to a completed substantive offense. If

because you feel bad about it, you're not suddenly not quilty

you go and commit a bank robbery and you go back the next day

8 of it. And as counsel for Mr. Zheng said, essentially

9 conceded, yeah, he did it, I guess that part was wrong, but he

10 tried to make up for it.

But he's also guilty of the conspiracy. Listen to the Court's instruction. Again, like everyone else has said, if anything I say differs, please follow the Court's instruction, not what I say. But what you'll hear about what is required to withdraw from a criminal conspiracy is that it's a significant burden, an extremely high burden. The defendant must have, in good faith, completely withdrawn and taken steps to terminate or abandon his efforts. By way of example, I expect you will hear a person withdraws when they call the police in time or do things that make it impossible to commit the crime. Think about what Zheng did. He committed the crime. He went there, he posted the note. The note was received. The family was terrified. And then he went back to the scene of the crime, looked around and left. That's not withdrawal. That's the best version of it. But

Rebuttal Summation - Mr. Heeren 2114 1 that's not the only inference or the most likely inference you 2 can draw. The most likely inference, the fair inference to 3 draw is that he went back to confirm the crime was completed, 4 to confirm they got the message. You heard from Vincent Kuang 5 that they were unsure whether they still lived there. saw packages. That the people directing them had said find 6 7 out, and that's what he was really doing. Was the message received? He saw the note was taken, the message was 8 9 received. That's not withdrawal. That's continuing the 10 conspiracy. And mind you, that confirmation allowed that conspiracy to continue and the pressure to be rachet up, 11 12 because after that mailings continued to arrive at these 13 victims' homes. 14 How else do you know Zheng didn't withdraw? Because 15 when he was finally arrested, he didn't say you're right, I 16 didn't -- this is wrong, I went back, I tried to stop it, I'm 17 so sorry. He lied. He lied and lied. He said, quote, "I didn't post the note." Quote, "All I did was give Vincent a 18 19 ride to that address." That's not true. 20 You saw the trail camera footage. Watch it again. Who was leading the charge? Zheng was in the front the whole 21

time leading the way, showing where to go. Mr. Kuang is guilty too, but Zheng was the one leading the way.

22

23

24

25

The idea that Zheng withdrew is just not accurate, it's not consistent with the evidence. You can safely reject Rebuttal Summation - Mr. Heeren

2115

it and you can convict Zheng not only of the substantive offenses, but the conspiracies as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, I want to touch on one other point counsel for Mr. Zheng made, which is his other primary argument, is that he didn't know, the only evidence is that he knew he was receiving this message from a gangster. That's essentially the argument. So he couldn't have possibly known that this message actually came from the Chinese government. And I believe my colleague briefly mentioned this, but you're going to hear from the Court about conscious avoidance, and the Court is going to tell you that you cannot deliberately close your eyes to what should have been known to you. circumstances show that Zheng knew or, at best, closed his eyes. Again, the note is clear as a bell. It talks about going to prison. It was not a complex message or a difficult one to comprehend. It was written in a language he understood. There is evidence in the record of that.

And the surrounding circumstances further show this. Zheng and Kuang were checking if the victims were home by knocking on the door, twisting the handle. Because as Kuang told you, if they were home, they were going to read it right to them and hand it to them. Zheng told you -- excuse me. Kuang told you that Zheng knew that Kuang knew about Operation FOX HUNT from Chinese social media and that Zheng paid attention to the same social media. And you know that Zheng

Rebuttal Summation - Mr. Heeren

talked privately with Chen Chaohong about this conduct beforehand and knew that others were previously involved.

The scheme itself, the message itself is enough to show that Zheng knew or closed his eyes as to what was obvious to him. So not only is he guilty of stalking and harassment, which I think is effectively conceded in some respects, but he did so knowing that it was directed by the Chinese government.

I want to briefly address now some of the arguments made by Zhu Yong's counsel in the last few minutes I have here. And I guess the first one I want to start with is this idea that he doesn't do anything but act to hire Michael McMahon and then he's gone. Mr. Tung said he was terminated after 2016, that's it, done. But then if you saw towards the very end, you remember sort of an important fact, which is Mr. Zhu kept working as part of this conspiracy. He went back. He himself went to the home of the victim two years later, took pictures, and then four days after that gets on an airplane and goes to China. What is the only reasonable inference for that? The only reasonable inference is that he's continuing to directly participate in this conspiracy.

And again, the idea that Zhu Yong just hired Mr. McMahon, that he had no other involvement, think about that. Think about the evidence you saw. This wasn't simply a person passing a form in a single e-mail. Think about all those e-mails in 2016. Think about the sheer volume of

Rebuttal Summation - Mr. Heeren

sensitive personal information that was passed from Zhu Yong
to Michael McMahon through the translator. That document that
we had to redact heavily because it had so much personal
information of the victims on it, that came from Zhu Yong.
That's not somebody who just hired somebody. That's a man
working on behalf of the Chinese government to pass detailed,

 ${\tt detailed\ information.}$ 

And I want to go back to this 2018 point. I believe Counsel said that there was -- there couldn't possibly be any reason why he did this as part of the conspiracy, there's no reason to go back to Liu Yan's house in 2018 since they found Xu Jin at the Warren residence. That was his argument you heard just a few moments ago. That's not true. He went back because he wanted to see if they were still there. And when he saw the car in the driveway and he brought the pictures of the car in the driveway back to China, what happened over the course of the next year? Mailing after mailing after mailing to that address, to the Short Hills Drive address.

Mr. Zhu was a middleman, as he described, but he was a critical essential piece of the conspiracy.

I also want to address the point, and it was raised again, that Zhu Yong only did this to collect a private debt. Everyone knows now that's not true. The evidence demonstrates that's just not true. The idea that he was collecting a private debt is belied by his own statements when he was

5112

Rebuttal Summation - Mr. Heeren

2118

interviewed by us, when he said, well, they were trying to get
him to return to China, that there was a whole group of
departments trying to get him and they would get a reward if

they would get the victim. It makes no sense.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And just finally in the few minutes I have left, I want to address counsel for Zhu Yong's suggestion that there's no evidence that he knowingly, knowingly engaged with Chinese government officials. If you remember, he put up that qq.com e-mail address and he said, well, it's just a series of numbers, how could he possibly have known who it is? Think about what he's trying to get you to infer. The evidence shows that Zhu Yong was in contact with Sun Hui and with Hu Ji, two key members of the conspiracy. The evidence also showed that Hu Ji, as you know and you heard so much about, came here and participated directly in the harassment of the family. And the evidence shows that Sun Hui was receiving reports back through Johnny Zhu, another member of the conspiracy. If you go back in the record, you'll see that same e-mail address was used by Johnny Zhu to deliver reporting in April 2017. So the idea here -- just think about The idea is that this was entirely a coincidence, that Jason Zhu inadvertently was communicating with these same Chinese government officials directing this campaign, giving them the same types of information they want and need and it was purely a coincidence. That defies common sense and you

similarly put in brackets the names of the alleged coconspirators where they should go in the overt acts.

So why don't you folks talk about it.

24

25

| Case 1 | :21-cr-00265-PKC Document 302 Filed 08/30/24 Page 190 of 219 PageID #: 5116 |
|--------|---|
|        | Rebuttal Summation - Mr. Heeren 2122  |
| 1      | they were docketed I think yesterday, right.                                |
| 2      | MR. LUSTBERG: Yes, Your Honor.  |
| 3      | THE COURT: Okay, great.   |
| 4      | Have a great night everyone.  |
| 5      | You don't need to be here at 9:00, but just be ready                        |
| 6      | to go at 9:30.  |
| 7      | (Matter adjourned to Thursday, June 15, 2023 at                             |
| 8      | 9:30.)  |
| 9      |   |
| 10     |   |
| 11     |   |
| 12     |   |
| 13     |   |
| 14     |   |
| 15     |   |
| 16     |   |
| 17     |   |
| 18     |   |
| 19     |   |
| 20     |   |
| 21     |   |
| 22     |   |
| 23     |   |
| 24     |   |
| 25     |   |

| Case 1 | :21-cr-00265-PKC Docun | nent 302 Filed 08/30/24 | Page 191 of 219 PageID #: |
|--------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
|        |                        | 5117                    | 2123                      |
| 1      |                        |                         |                           |
| 2      |                        | INDEX                   |                           |
| 3      | WITNESS                |                         | PAGE                      |
| 4      |                        |                         | 100=                      |
| 5      |                        | BY MS. ARFA             |                           |
| 6      |                        | BY MR. LUSTERBERG       |                           |
| 7      |                        | BY MR. GOLDBERGER       |                           |
| 8      | SUMMATION              | BY MR. TUNG             | 2068                      |
| 9      | REBUTTAL SUMMATION     | BY MR. HEEREN           | 2108                      |
| 10     |                        |                         |                           |
| 11     |                        |                         |                           |
| 12     |                        |                         |                           |
| 13     |                        |                         |                           |
| 14     |                        |                         |                           |
| 15     |                        |                         |                           |
| 16     |                        |                         |                           |
| 17     |                        |                         |                           |
| 18     |                        |                         |                           |
| 19     |                        |                         |                           |
| 20     |                        |                         |                           |
| 21     |                        |                         |                           |
| 22     |                        |                         |                           |
| 23     |                        |                         |                           |
| 24     |                        |                         |                           |
| 25     |                        |                         |                           |
|        |                        |                         |                           |

```
2023/22 2024/312078/11 2078/23
                                     2079/3 2093/4 2119/15
MR. GOLDBERGER: [11] 1966/1
                                     THE JURY: [3] 1937/23 1990/24
1967/2 2047/25 2048/1 2048/4
                                     2048/3
2049/10 2051/12 2054/21 2062/2
                                     THE LAW CLERK: [1] 2121/13
2065/21 2066/20
MR. HEERAN: [7] 2032/3 2041/6
2080/20 2084/23 2086/2 2089/25
                                     $1,000 [1] 1980/21
2090/3
                                     $11,000 [2] 2018/24 2019/4
MR. HEEREN: [34] 1935/10 1936/7
                                     $19,000 [7] 1967/23 1982/3 2018/11
2046/12 2046/18 2049/2 2051/9
                                     2018/12 2018/18 2032/9 2032/24
2054/16 2065/10 2066/12 2068/8
                                     $2,000 [2] 1980/15 1980/21
2075/12 2076/4 2078/9 2078/14
                                     $200 [2] 1980/25 2084/16
2078/16 2078/20 2079/1 2079/4
                                     $3,000 [4] 1980/21 1980/22 2030/21
2079/13 2093/15 2094/11 2096/16
                                     2053/10
2099/24 2107/16 2107/18 2107/21
                                     $5,000 [5] 1946/17 1979/10 1980/3
2108/9 2108/12 2108/15 2119/4
                                     1980/6 2027/16
2120/14 2120/17 2121/10 2121/21
                                     $5,945 [1] 1979/18
MR. LUSTBERG: [8] 2003/2 2023/8
                                     $50 [1] 2030/13
2023/11 2023/13 2023/16 2023/21
                                     $50,000 [1] 2032/9
2121/2 2122/2
                                     $58 [1] 2030/13
MR. LUSTERBERG (CONTINUING):
                                     $6,000 [1] 1979/25
[1] 2023/1
                                     $600 [1] 2084/16
MR. LUSTERBERG: [15] 1934/17
                                     $8,000 [1] 2018/24
1934/21 1935/15 1990/7 1990/15
1990/22 1990/25 1994/12 2024/8
2032/5 2041/9 2042/2 2046/15
                                     '36 [1] 1942/6
2046/21 2047/5
                                     '37 [1] 1942/6
MR. TUNG: [39] 1935/7 2067/24
                                     '51 [1] 1951/17
2068/1 2068/4 2068/10 2068/13
                                     '73 [1] 1981/25
2068/17 2069/18 2069/22 2072/24
                                     '99 [1] 1947/9
2075/18 2076/9 2076/15 2077/13
2078/17 2079/5 2079/18 2079/22
2080/22 2085/1 2085/11 2085/14
                                                ----x [2] 1933/2
2085/17 2085/20 2085/23 2086/9
                                     1933/8
2087/12 2087/14 2087/16 2090/6
2091/17 2093/8 2093/17 2094/13
2096/20 2100/1 2104/3 2104/6
                                     0316 [1] 2082/13
2106/21
                                     0317 [1] 2083/12
MS. ARFA: [8] 1935/13 1937/22
                                     0402U [1] 2099/21
1937/24 1952/2 1966/10 1967/9
                                     0703-E [1] 2086/11
1971/2 1987/2
                                     0807F [1] 2097/12
THE COURT: [97] 1934/2 1934/19
                                     0812C [1] 2098/3
1935/1 1935/8 1935/11 1935/14
1935/21 1936/12 1936/18 1936/25
1966/2 1967/4 1989/15 1989/24
                                     10 [10] 1968/1 1980/21 1986/13
1990/4 1990/8 1990/13 1990/16
                                     1987/4 1989/7 1989/17 1989/20
1994/9 2023/6 2023/9 2023/12
                                     1989/20 1989/20 2101/16
2023/14 2023/17 2023/24 2024/5
                                     10 years [2] 1938/20 1951/3
2032/4 2041/7 2046/13 2046/19
                                     100 [2] 1976/1 2021/9
2047/3 2047/17 2049/3 2051/10
                                     100 percent [1] 2021/22
2054/17 2065/11 2066/13 2067/19
                                     1001 [1] 2050/19
2067/25 2068/9 2068/11 2068/14
                                     1020 [1] 1941/6
2069/14 2069/20 2072/21 2075/13
                                     1022 [2] 2000/24 2001/1
2076/5 2076/11 2077/11 2078/7
                                     1034 [1] 1942/6
2078/12 2078/15 2078/18 2078/21
                                     107 [1] 2043/12
2079/14 2080/10 2084/24 2085/10
                                     108 [2] 1950/25 1985/22
2085/13 2085/15 2085/18 2085/22
                                     1088 [1] 2005/24
2085/24 2086/6 2087/11 2087/13
                                     1089 [1] 2005/24
2087/15 2090/1 2090/4 2091/12
                                     10th [2] 1980/14 1993/20
2091/19 2092/2 2093/2 2093/6
                                     11 [2] 1948/16 1980/22
2093/14 2093/16 2094/12 2096/17
                                     11201 [1] 1933/15
2099/22 2099/25 2104/1 2104/4
                                     11th [1] 1993/20
2106/19 2107/13 2107/17 2107/19
                                     12 [2] 2083/14 2100/15
2108/2 2108/11 2119/2 2119/6
                                     126 [1] 1963/19
2119/17 2120/16 2120/18 2121/4
                                     12:00 [1] 1989/21
2121/14 2121/22 2122/3
                                     12th [2] 2083/19 2100/11
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: [11]
                                     13 [4] 1975/3 1979/17 2001/19
```

1936/16 1936/23 1989/22 1990/11

2101/18 1392 [1] 1947/18 14 [2] 1933/5 2003/12 15 [8] 1944/19 1989/24 2002/2 2082/24 2091/17 2091/22 2092/2 2122/7 15-minute [1] 2104/2 16 [1] 1944/19 180 degrees [1] 1963/21 1800 [1] 2098/4 19 [1] 2002/7 191 [1] 2015/3 1968 [1] 2029/25 19960165 [1] 2073/5 1:00 [2] 1990/18 2023/7 1:00 o'clock [2] 2053/1 2057/18 1K [1] 2003/3 1st [2] 2097/18 2098/3 20 [1] 2026/5 20 percent [1] 1982/21 2002 [1] 1948/11 2016 [54] 1940/19 1940/24 1941/17 1942/2 1943/7 1944/14 1955/21 1956/3 1962/19 1967/12 1968/7 1969/8 1969/25 1971/25 1972/2 1975/2 1975/3 1975/4 1977/25 1979/9 1979/16 1979/18 1982/15 1982/15 1982/22 1993/16 1993/17 2004/19 2042/21 2043/3 2043/4 2046/5 2071/21 2081/20 2082/17 2082/18 2082/21 2082/23 2083/1 2083/4 2083/8 2084/1 2084/3 2087/21 2087/25 2090/14 2091/10 2093/21 2096/6 2097/3 2104/23 2105/14 2116/13 2116/25 2017 [38] 1944/20 1944/24 1945/6 1946/10 1946/18 1948/16 1956/2 1956/20 1962/21 1967/15 1974/25 1976/4 1976/24 1980/3 1980/14 1980/21 1980/22 1980/24 1982/22 1983/16 1983/22 1984/2 1993/19 1999/12 2034/15 2034/18 2043/22 2052/16 2083/14 2083/14 2083/22 2088/2 2097/18 2098/4 2100/5 2100/7 2100/15 2118/20 2018 [20] 1950/4 1950/11 1950/16 1961/3 1963/3 1968/1 1972/8 2041/12 2043/24 2045/13 2049/20 2052/16 2054/25 2060/23 2101/7 2101/19 2101/22 2102/12 2117/8 2117/11 2019 [5] 1952/5 1968/7 2043/21 2043/25 2100/5 2020 [1] 2019/5 2022 [1] 2022/8 2023 [2] 1933/5 2122/7 2029 [1] 2026/12 2033 [1] 1943/17 20th [1] 1977/25 21 [1] 2002/11 21-CR-265 [1] 1933/2 22 [1] 1950/10 23 [1] 1950/10 236 [2] 2015/3 2015/3 237 [2] 2015/3 2015/3 238 [1] 2015/3

24 [2] 2003/15 2022/8

| Case 1:21-cr-00265-PKC Doc  | ument°302°  | 'age 193 of 219 PageID #: 2  |
|---|---|--|
| 2   | 5:00 [1] 210 <mark>5/\$19</mark>  | 1981/1 1981/8 1981/9 1981/10   |
|   | 5.00 [1] 210 <del>0/0</del> = 0   |  |
| 2419 [1] 1933/22  | 5:29 [1] 2119/7   | 1981/14 1981/17 1981/18 1982/14  |
| 26 [2] 2002/13 2082/21  | 5:30 [2] 2107/15 2108/6   | 1982/14 1982/18 1982/22 1997/20  |
|   | 5th [11] 1946/18 1975/1 1979/9  | 2003/4 2004/17 2004/22 2005/1  |
| 2639 [1] 1933/23  | 1979/16 1984/2 1993/19 2083/19  | 2026/23 2027/14 2027/14 2028/15  |
| 265 [1] 1933/2  |   |  |
| 27 [9] 1942/13 1974/25 1980/24  | 2084/3 2093/21 2094/6 2096/6  | 2028/16 2028/17 2028/19 2028/22  |
| 2081/20 2082/23 2083/1 2084/1   | G   | 2028/23 2028/23 2028/24 2029/3   |
|   | 6   | 2029/4 2029/5 2029/6 2029/11   |
| 2084/3 2087/21  | 68 [1] 2021/6   | 2029/12 2029/13 2029/23 2029/24  |
| 271 [1] 1933/14   | 697 [1] 1947/9  |  |
| 28 [3] 2003/3 2019/5 2083/4   |   | 2030/3 2030/6 2030/9 2030/12   |
| 29 [1] 2083/8   | 6th [4] 1948/5 1956/8 1993/17 1993/19   |  |
|   | 7   | accountable [1] 1939/12  |
| 2:00 [3] 1989/20 2023/17 2023/24  | 7   | accounts [10] 1981/8 1981/17 1995/16   |
| 3   | 703-D [3] 2085/12 2085/13 2085/25   | 1995/16 1995/17 2002/8 2005/2  |
| <u>ა</u>  |   |  |
| 3007 [1] 2079/19  | 704-A [1] 1983/21   | 2016/16 2026/18 2027/13  |
|   | 704A [1] 1946/9   | accurate [2] 1979/24 2114/24   |
| 3009 [3] 1992/25 2078/6 2078/17   | 709 [1] 1961/9  | accused [2] 1993/12 2044/18  |
| 3011 [1] 1971/8   | 709-A [1] 1985/22   | accusing [2] 1950/2 1950/3   |
| 3013 [1] 2080/22  |   |  |
| 3026 [1] 1994/24  | 709A [1] 1950/25  | achieve [1] 1958/2   |
|   | 713 [2] 1944/18 1950/10   | acknowledge [1] 2011/13  |
| 3028 [1] 2042/24  | 718-613-2419 [1] 1933/22  | acknowledged [1] 2004/5  |
| 3034 [1] 2015/25  | 718-613-2639 [1] 1933/23  |  |
| 3047 [1] 2004/11  |   | acknowledges [1] 2011/15   |
| 3056 [2] 1995/7 2004/18   | 730 [1] 1964/4  | acquit [1] 2063/6  |
|   | 732 [1] 1963/22   | act [15] 1954/23 1964/22 1965/2  |
| 3061 [1] 2029/8   | 78 [1] 1944/11  | 1965/4 1965/9 1965/14 1972/6   |
| 3063 [1] 1944/18  | 79 [1] 1944/11  | 2005/17 2045/25 2052/12 2052/15  |
| 3065 [1] 1944/18  |   |  |
| 307 [1] 2080/6  | 7:00 o'clock [1] 2027/5   | 2070/8 2073/21 2113/5 2116/11  |
|   | 0   | acted [18] 1939/15 1945/10 1953/5  |
| 3072 [1] 1981/24  | 8   | 1964/9 1964/14 1964/18 1964/19   |
| 3075 [1] 1981/25  | 805B [7] 1948/11 1948/19 2001/19  | 1965/19 1967/9 1967/12 1967/24   |
| 314 [1] 2015/2  |   |  |
| 315 [1] 2101/8  | 2002/2 2002/7 2002/11 2002/11   | 1968/5 1968/17 1987/21 2065/9  |
|   | 82 years [1] 1946/20  | 2071/1 2071/8 2071/17  |
| 316 [3] 1942/21 1978/4 1998/22  |   | acting [15] 1964/8 1965/4 1965/6   |
| 317 [1] 1998/23   | 9   | 1966/25 1968/23 1969/4 1985/3  |
| 33 [1] 1963/22  | 004 B [4] 4070/44   | 1900/23 1900/23 1909/4 1903/3  |
|   |   | 4007/40 0044/0 0000/04 0007/0  |
|   | 901-D [1] 1970/14   | 1987/10 2011/6 2030/24 2067/8  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1   | 902E [1] 1942/24  | 1987/10 2011/6 2030/24 2067/8<br>2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1   |   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1<br>4  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1   | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1<br>4<br>40 minutes [1] 1978/1   | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6<br>activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6<br>activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9<br>2047/11   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23   | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A<br>a.m [1] 1933/5  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6<br>activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9<br>2047/11<br>activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23   | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A<br>a.m [1] 1933/5<br>Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6<br>activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9<br>2047/11<br>activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14<br>acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3   | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A<br>a.m [1] 1933/5<br>Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23<br>abandon [1] 2113/18  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6<br>activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9<br>2047/11<br>activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14<br>acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9<br>2120/16 2120/17 2120/24   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3   | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A<br>a.m [1] 1933/5<br>Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23<br>abandon [1] 2113/18<br>abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6<br>activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9<br>2047/11<br>activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14<br>acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019B [1] 2093/13  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A<br>a.m [1] 1933/5<br>Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23<br>abandon [1] 2113/18  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6<br>activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9<br>2047/11<br>activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14<br>acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9<br>2120/16 2120/17 2120/24<br>actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A<br>a.m [1] 1933/5<br>Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23<br>abandon [1] 2113/18<br>abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23<br>abet [1] 2038/16   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6<br>activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9<br>2047/11<br>activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14<br>acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9<br>2120/16 2120/17 2120/24<br>actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10<br>2086/11 2086/24  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19   | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A<br>a.m [1] 1933/5<br>Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23<br>abandon [1] 2113/18<br>abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23<br>abet [1] 2038/16<br>abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6<br>activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9<br>2047/11<br>activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14<br>acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9<br>2120/16 2120/17 2120/24<br>actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10<br>2086/11 2086/24<br>added [1] 2082/24   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A<br>a.m [1] 1933/5<br>Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23<br>abandon [1] 2113/18<br>abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23<br>abet [1] 2038/16<br>abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12<br>abetting [1] 2038/14  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6<br>activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9<br>2047/11<br>activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14<br>acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9<br>2120/16 2120/17 2120/24<br>actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10<br>2086/11 2086/24<br>added [1] 2082/24<br>addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19 403-A [1] 1981/24   | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A  a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19 403-A [1] 1981/24 407 [1] 2014/10   | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A<br>a.m [1] 1933/5<br>Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23<br>abandon [1] 2113/18<br>abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23<br>abet [1] 2038/16<br>abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12<br>abetting [1] 2038/14<br>ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2<br>able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17<br>actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4<br>2029/20 2036/25 2071/13<br>actively [1] 1963/6<br>activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9<br>2047/11<br>activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14<br>acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9<br>2120/16 2120/17 2120/24<br>actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10<br>2086/11 2086/24<br>added [1] 2082/24<br>addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19 403-A [1] 1981/24 407 [1] 2014/10 408-C [1] 2036/2  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A  a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19 403-A [1] 1981/24 407 [1] 2014/10 408-C [1] 2036/2 408-D [1] 2035/20  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A<br>a.m [1] 1933/5<br>Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23<br>abandon [1] 2113/18<br>abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23<br>abet [1] 2038/16<br>abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12<br>abetting [1] 2038/14<br>ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2<br>able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14<br>1963/15 2035/25 2075/9   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19 403-A [1] 1981/24 407 [1] 2014/10 408-C [1] 2036/2  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A<br>a.m [1] 1933/5<br>Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23<br>abandon [1] 2113/18<br>abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23<br>abet [1] 2038/16<br>abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12<br>abetting [1] 2038/14<br>ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2<br>able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14<br>1963/15 2035/25 2075/9<br>absence [1] 2088/3   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19 403-A [1] 1981/24 407 [1] 2014/10 408-C [1] 2035/20 408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A  a.m [1] 1933/5  Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23  abandon [1] 2113/18  abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23  abet [1] 2038/16  abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12  abetting [1] 2038/14  ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2  able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14  1963/15 2035/25 2075/9  absence [1] 2088/3  absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19 403-A [1] 1981/24 407 [1] 2014/10 408-C [1] 2035/20 408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4 410 [1] 2014/17   | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19 403-A [1] 1981/24 407 [1] 2014/10 408-C [1] 2035/20 408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4 410 [1] 2014/17 431-K [1] 1970/7   | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A  a.m [1] 1933/5  Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23  abandon [1] 2113/18  abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23  abet [1] 2038/16  abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12  abetting [1] 2038/14  ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2  able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14  1963/15 2035/25 2075/9  absence [1] 2088/3  absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19 403-A [1] 1981/24 407 [1] 2014/10 408-C [1] 2035/20 408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4 410 [1] 2014/17 431-K [1] 1970/7 434 [1] 2020/4  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19 403-A [1] 1981/24 407 [1] 2014/10 408-C [1] 2035/20 408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4 410 [1] 2014/17 431-K [1] 1970/7   | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24   | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24  452 [1] 2031/13  | 902E [1] 1942/24<br>902F [1] 1996/7<br>9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5<br>9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8<br>A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19 403-A [1] 1981/24 407 [1] 2014/10 408-C [1] 2035/20 408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4 410 [1] 2014/17 431-K [1] 1970/7 434 [1] 2020/4 436-A [1] 1981/24 452 [1] 2031/13 467 [1] 2021/6  | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24  452 [1] 2031/13  467 [1] 2021/6  4:15 [1] 2091/14  | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20 accessed [2] 1967/17 1976/14  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15 2101/24 2114/19 2116/8 2117/18   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24  452 [1] 2031/13  467 [1] 2021/6  4:15 [1] 2091/14  4:30 [1] 2092/3  | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20 accessed [2] 1967/17 1976/14 accessing [1] 2026/17  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15 2101/24 2114/19 2116/8 2117/18 2117/18 2117/21 2118/6 2118/9  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24  452 [1] 2031/13  467 [1] 2021/6  4:15 [1] 2091/14  4:30 [1] 2092/3  | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20 accessed [2] 1967/17 1976/14 accessing [1] 2026/17 accidently [1] 2091/3  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15 2101/24 2114/19 2116/8 2117/18 2117/18 2117/21 2118/6 2118/9 2118/19 2119/20  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-D [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24  452 [1] 2031/13  467 [1] 2021/6  4:15 [1] 2091/14  4:30 [1] 2092/3  4th [6] 1946/10 1950/16 1980/3   | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20 accessed [2] 1967/17 1976/14 accessing [1] 2026/17 accidently [1] 2091/3 accompanied [1] 1946/22  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15 2101/24 2114/19 2116/8 2117/18 2117/18 2117/21 2118/6 2118/9  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24  452 [1] 2031/13  467 [1] 2021/6  4:15 [1] 2091/14  4:30 [1] 2092/3  | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20 accessed [2] 1967/17 1976/14 accessing [1] 2026/17 accidently [1] 2091/3 accompanied [1] 1946/22 accompany [2] 1947/17 1959/13  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15 2101/24 2114/19 2116/8 2117/18 2117/18 2117/21 2118/6 2118/9 2118/19 2119/20  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1 4004 [1] 2094/10 4006-B [1] 1978/4 4010 [1] 1984/8 4012 [1] 2089/23 4018 [1] 1976/3 4019-B [1] 1976/3 4019B [1] 2093/13 402U [1] 2099/23 402Y [1] 1942/19 403-A [1] 1981/24 407 [1] 2014/10 408-C [1] 2035/20 408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4 410 [1] 2014/17 431-K [1] 1970/7 434 [1] 2020/4 436-A [1] 1981/24 452 [1] 2031/13 467 [1] 2021/6 4:15 [1] 2091/14 4:30 [1] 2092/3 4th [6] 1946/10 1950/16 1980/3 1983/22 2055/1 2060/23  | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20 accessed [2] 1967/17 1976/14 accessing [1] 2026/17 accidently [1] 2091/3 accompanied [1] 1946/22  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15 2101/24 2114/19 2116/8 2117/18 2117/18 2117/21 2118/6 2118/9 2118/19 2119/20 addresses [5] 1944/16 1944/17 2040/6 2040/13 2042/23  |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-D [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24  452 [1] 2031/13  467 [1] 2021/6  4:15 [1] 2091/14  4:30 [1] 2092/3  4th [6] 1946/10 1950/16 1980/3  1983/22 2055/1 2060/23   | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20 accessed [2] 1967/17 1976/14 accessing [1] 2026/17 accidently [1] 2091/3 accompanied [1] 1946/22 accompany [2] 1947/17 1959/13 accomplish [2] 1959/14 2025/25   | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15 2101/24 2114/19 2116/8 2117/18 2117/18 2117/21 2118/6 2118/9 2118/19 2119/20 addresses [5] 1944/16 1944/17 2040/6 2040/13 2042/23 addressing [2] 1990/25 2037/18   |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-D [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24  452 [1] 2031/13  467 [1] 2021/6  4:15 [1] 2091/14  4:30 [1] 2092/3  4th [6] 1946/10 1950/16 1980/3  1983/22 2055/1 2060/23  5  50 [1] 1951/17  | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20 accessed [2] 1967/17 1976/14 accessing [1] 2026/17 accidently [1] 2091/3 accompanied [1] 1946/22 accompany [2] 1947/17 1959/13 accomplish [2] 1959/14 2025/25 accordance [1] 1978/12  | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15 2101/24 2114/19 2116/8 2117/18 2117/18 2117/21 2118/6 2118/9 2118/19 2119/20 addresses [5] 1944/16 1944/17 2040/6 2040/13 2042/23 addressing [2] 1990/25 2037/18 adduced [1] 2033/24                           |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-D [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24  452 [1] 2031/13  467 [1] 2021/6  4:15 [1] 2091/14  4:30 [1] 2092/3  4th [6] 1946/10 1950/16 1980/3  1983/22 2055/1 2060/23  5  50 [1] 1951/17  | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20 accessed [2] 1967/17 1976/14 accessing [1] 2026/17 accidently [1] 2091/3 accompanied [1] 1946/22 accompany [2] 1947/17 1959/13 accomplish [2] 1959/14 2025/25 accordance [1] 1978/12 according [3] 2028/2 2040/24 2071/6                                      | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15 2101/24 2114/19 2116/8 2117/18 2117/18 2117/21 2118/6 2118/9 2118/19 2119/20 addresses [5] 1944/16 1944/17 2040/6 2040/13 2042/23 addressing [2] 1990/25 2037/18 adduced [1] 2033/24 adjourned [1] 2122/7      |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24  452 [1] 2031/13  467 [1] 2021/6  4:15 [1] 2091/14  4:30 [1] 2092/3  4th [6] 1946/10 1950/16 1980/3  1983/22 2055/1 2060/23  5  50 [1] 1951/17  50 percent [1] 2062/18                                     | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A  a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20 accessed [2] 1967/17 1976/14 accessing [1] 2026/17 accidently [1] 2091/3 accompanied [1] 1946/22 accompany [2] 1947/17 1959/13 accomplish [2] 1959/14 2025/25 accordance [1] 1978/12 according [3] 2028/2 2040/24 2071/6 account [50] 1979/15 1979/16 1980/1 | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15 2101/24 2114/19 2116/8 2117/18 2117/18 2117/21 2118/6 2118/9 2118/19 2119/20 addresses [5] 1944/16 1944/17 2040/6 2040/13 2042/23 addressing [2] 1990/25 2037/18 adduced [1] 2033/24                           |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-D [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24  452 [1] 2031/13  467 [1] 2021/6  4:15 [1] 2091/14  4:30 [1] 2092/3  4th [6] 1946/10 1950/16 1980/3  1983/22 2055/1 2060/23  5  50 [1] 1951/17  50 percent [1] 2062/18  506 [1] 1952/13 | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20 accessed [2] 1967/17 1976/14 accessing [1] 2026/17 accidently [1] 2091/3 accompanied [1] 1946/22 accompany [2] 1947/17 1959/13 accomplish [2] 1959/14 2025/25 accordance [1] 1978/12 according [3] 2028/2 2040/24 2071/6                                      | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15 2101/24 2114/19 2116/8 2117/18 2117/18 2117/21 2118/6 2118/9 2118/19 2119/20 addresses [5] 1944/16 1944/17 2040/6 2040/13 2042/23 addressing [2] 1990/25 2037/18 adduced [1] 2122/7 Administration [1] 1977/24 |
| 3rd [3] 1945/6 1983/16 2055/1  4  40 minutes [1] 1978/1  4004 [1] 2094/10  4006-B [1] 1978/4  4010 [1] 1984/8  4012 [1] 2089/23  4018 [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 1976/3  4019-B [1] 2093/13  402U [1] 2099/23  402Y [1] 1942/19  403-A [1] 1981/24  407 [1] 2014/10  408-C [1] 2035/20  408-I [2] 2035/19 2036/4  410 [1] 2014/17  431-K [1] 1970/7  434 [1] 2020/4  436-A [1] 1981/24  452 [1] 2031/13  467 [1] 2021/6  4:15 [1] 2091/14  4:30 [1] 2092/3  4th [6] 1946/10 1950/16 1980/3  1983/22 2055/1 2060/23  5  50 [1] 1951/17  50 percent [1] 2062/18                                     | 902E [1] 1942/24 902F [1] 1996/7 9:00 [2] 1933/5 2122/5 9:30 [3] 2119/19 2122/6 2122/8  A  a.m [1] 1933/5 Aarm.edny [1] 1933/23 abandon [1] 2113/18 abduction [2] 1957/17 1957/23 abet [1] 2038/16 abetted [2] 1955/15 2038/12 abetting [1] 2038/14 ability [3] 1936/8 2054/1 2054/2 able [7] 1948/6 1948/7 1948/8 1959/14 1963/15 2035/25 2075/9 absence [1] 2088/3 absolutely [4] 1958/7 1960/1 1985/20 1986/10 accept [3] 1945/4 2024/10 2049/7 accepted [1] 1945/5 access [4] 1977/6 1977/6 1977/7 2104/20 accessed [2] 1967/17 1976/14 accessing [1] 2026/17 accidently [1] 2091/3 accompanied [1] 1946/22 accompany [2] 1947/17 1959/13 accomplish [2] 1959/14 2025/25 accordance [1] 1978/12 according [3] 2028/2 2040/24 2071/6 account [50] 1979/15 1979/16 1980/1 | 2068/19 2071/4 2072/5 2077/17 actions [6] 1956/19 1979/1 2016/4 2029/20 2036/25 2071/13 actively [1] 1963/6 activities [4] 2015/20 2016/21 2026/9 2047/11 activity [2] 1976/23 1977/14 acts [6] 1962/15 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16 2120/17 2120/24 actual [5] 2000/6 2027/9 2086/10 2086/11 2086/24 added [1] 2082/24 addition [2] 2063/21 2098/24 additional [4] 1969/19 1972/9 1984/21 1988/7 address [42] 1947/25 1948/1 1948/10 1949/12 1950/13 1955/20 1969/18 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 1977/2 1988/13 2020/4 2022/7 2027/11 2027/17 2040/23 2040/23 2042/6 2042/14 2042/19 2042/21 2043/9 2043/19 2044/2 2044/7 2073/5 2073/9 2073/11 2073/13 2074/11 2080/15 2101/24 2114/19 2116/8 2117/18 2117/18 2117/21 2118/6 2118/9 2118/19 2119/20 addresses [5] 1944/16 1944/17 2040/6 2040/13 2042/23 addressing [2] 1990/25 2037/18 adduced [1] 2033/24 adjourned [1] 2122/7      |

ahead [18] 1934/3 1937/21 1966/9 1967/8 1990/21 1994/11 2067/25 2068/12 2068/16 2069/17 2069/21 2079/17 2086/6 2090/4 2093/16 2099/25 2108/8 2121/19 aid [1] 2038/16 aided [3] 1933/25 1955/14 2038/12 aiding [1] 2038/13 airplane [1] 2116/18 airport [3] 1996/24 2084/12 2084/14 AL [1] 1933/6 albeit [1] 2030/3 alert [1] 2105/18 alerted [1] 2106/11 alias [8] 2003/20 2003/21 2003/23 2004/6 2004/20 2026/14 2077/7 2077/9 alleged [5] 1972/22 2038/23 2088/7 2120/12 2120/23 Allen [5] 2068/18 2097/7 2097/9 2097/19 2098/7 allow [1] 2017/4 allowed [8] 1977/7 1977/14 2016/24 2037/7 2043/8 2045/25 2050/22 2114/10 almost [9] 1937/24 1941/20 1963/13 1975/11 1979/25 1983/24 1993/12 2056/11 2064/16 alone [4] 1998/7 2038/21 2073/9 2073/13 alongside [1] 1956/21 aluminum [1] 2017/10 ambiguity [2] 2110/23 2120/20 AMERICA [2] 1933/3 2054/4 American [3] 2006/13 2007/7 2008/19 Americans [4] 2022/3 2022/13 2106/1 2106/1 amount [8] 1982/19 2018/23 2031/16 2031/17 2031/19 2032/10 2047/12 2110/1 amounts [2] 1982/5 2032/19 analysis [3] 1994/14 2032/15 2082/15 angry [1] 1959/25 answer [29] 1961/7 1987/7 1998/17 1999/2 1999/7 2005/19 2006/21 2007/25 2008/3 2008/5 2019/15 2021/6 2021/13 2021/17 2035/11 2040/18 2040/19 2041/5 2055/7 2085/4 2086/20 2087/3 2087/4 2087/7 2098/14 2098/18 2102/8 2102/8 2103/25 answered [5] 1950/21 1961/5 2055/5 2087/5 2095/2 answering [1] 2001/7 anticipate [1] 2119/19 Anticorruption [1] 1974/5 Anyway [1] 2011/13 apart [2] 1993/16 1993/24 apologies [1] 1990/4 apparent [1] 1957/14 appeal [1] 1948/23 APPEARANCES [1] 1933/12 appeared [1] 2035/12 appearing [1] 1961/6 application [1] 2035/24 applied [1] 1973/23 apply [1] 2066/3 applying [1] 2098/10

appreciate [1] 2121/4 approach [1] 1942/13 approached [2] 2022/3 2072/8 approaching [1] 1983/7 appropriate [2] 1936/13 2036/8 approval [1] 1978/16 April [38] 1945/6 1946/10 1946/18 1948/5 1948/16 1956/2 1956/20 1962/21 1967/15 1975/4 1976/4 1976/24 1980/3 1980/14 1980/21 1980/22 1980/24 1983/16 1983/22 1984/2 1993/19 1993/19 1993/20 1993/20 1999/12 2034/15 2034/18 2043/22 2083/14 2083/14 2083/19 2083/22 2097/18 2098/3 2100/7 2100/11 2100/15 2118/20 April 10 [1] 1980/21 April 10th [2] 1980/14 1993/20 April 11 [2] 1948/16 1980/22 April 11th [1] 1993/20 April 12 [2] 2083/14 2100/15 April 12th [1] 2100/11 April 1st [2] 2097/18 2098/3 April 2017 [6] 1956/20 1962/21 1976/4 2043/22 2083/22 2118/20 April 27 [1] 1980/24 April 3rd [2] 1945/6 1983/16 April 4 [1] 1975/4 April 4th [2] 1946/10 1983/22 April 5 [1] 2083/14 April 5th [4] 1946/18 1984/2 1993/19 2083/19 April 6 [3] 1976/24 2034/15 2034/18 April 6th [2] 1948/5 1993/19 April 7 [1] 2100/7 area [2] 2062/24 2100/4 ARFA [23] 1933/16 1935/11 1937/10 1937/12 1937/21 1989/15 1991/5 1997/14 1998/13 1999/14 1999/21 2000/11 2000/25 2007/2 2008/21 2010/15 2024/23 2028/10 2031/9 2031/13 2044/15 2045/11 2123/4 Arfa's [1] 2027/20 argue [5] 2042/6 2076/11 2101/1 2102/2 2102/20 argued [5] 1997/15 1998/13 2031/10 2040/5 2040/5 argues [6] 2016/15 2029/15 2034/7 2034/23 2042/5 2042/17 arguing [1] 2102/1 argument [31] 1937/4 1966/4 1966/8 1967/5 1967/6 2022/17 2027/22 2028/2 2028/12 2031/12 2031/15 2041/8 2043/7 2047/21 2047/22 2051/11 2065/18 2069/6 2076/9 2079/15 2082/8 2093/7 2094/6 2095/10 2096/19 2101/10 2103/1 2115/4 2115/7 2117/12 2119/1 arguments [6] 2019/23 2031/9 2049/5 2109/9 2112/20 2116/8 arm [2] 1942/23 1942/23 armed [1] 1948/25 ARMSTRONG [1] 1933/22 arranged [1] 1969/9 arrangement [1] 1935/23 arrangements [2] 1936/13 2097/23 arrest [10] 1941/23 1956/12 1957/5 1960/19 1974/6 1983/3 1983/11

backwards [1] 2064/16 backyard [1] 1950/24 bad [5] 2031/5 2063/23 2064/11 2106/3 2113/7 badly [1] 1951/7 bag [1] 2058/19 bagels [1] 2030/15 bait [1] 1948/2

Bless [1] 1941/25

blow [1] 1995/1 blue [1] 1994/7

board [3] 1938/5 1952/22 2104/16

boils [1] 1982/13 bonds [1] 2026/9 book [1] 2100/11

C-A-I-R [1] 2035/6 Cadman [1] 1933/14 CAIR [4] 1976/17 2035/6 2035/6 2035/23

C calculate [1] 2031/25 California [7] 2042/19 2048/20 2049/19 2052/22 2053/6 2060/10 2099/4 camera [1] 2114/20 cameras [1] 2013/3 campaign [18] 1939/5 1939/10 1940/17 1944/25 1945/12 1949/5 1957/4 1958/15 1958/17 1963/5 1963/7 1963/8 1965/22 1965/25 1966/11 1976/13 2013/13 2118/23 candidate [1] 1992/21 candidly [1] 2028/10 cannot [14] 1978/8 2006/23 2070/23 2075/10 2079/11 2089/5 2093/18 2096/22 2098/20 2098/20 2098/21 2101/15 2102/8 2115/11 Canti [2] 2025/4 2030/7 capable [2] 2010/14 2010/19 captured [2] 1942/22 2102/9 car [12] 1960/13 1976/25 2035/9 2035/14 2036/7 2036/12 2050/3 2050/3 2058/22 2060/11 2117/15 2117/16 carbon [1] 2056/23 card [8] 1941/10 1980/23 2030/19 2030/20 2030/21 2070/22 2089/14 2106/16 career [2] 2020/23 2046/4 careers [1] 2019/3 careful [6] 2046/14 2054/17 2075/14 2076/12 2106/19 2109/16 carefully [3] 2057/1 2062/10 2063/1 cares [1] 2102/7 carried [3] 1940/17 1955/4 2071/13 carry [4] 1946/16 1955/25 2069/4 2105/19 carrying [3] 1946/11 2014/14 2014/15 case [69] 1939/16 1948/18 1979/8 1979/9 1981/2 1981/13 1982/4 1982/17 1982/20 1982/23 1989/18 1991/18 1991/19 1992/23 1993/23 2003/17 2009/11 2010/2 2010/3 2010/23 2010/24 2010/24 2010/25 2012/11 2013/23 2016/1 2016/10 2016/23 2017/1 2018/11 2020/3 2020/15 2022/19 2023/19 2029/8 2029/24 2031/24 2032/21 2037/1 2038/2 2038/15 2043/22 2045/19 2046/5 2047/14 2048/9 2048/16 2048/22 2053/14 2054/4 2054/4 2054/12 2058/15 2059/24 2062/17 2063/10 2063/18 2064/2 2064/19 2065/25 2066/3 2068/6 2068/24 2091/21 2103/22 2108/24 2112/17 2119/8 2119/10 cases [4] 2036/3 2036/24 2048/24 2062/19 cash [20] 1946/17 1980/4 1980/6 1980/7 1980/9 1980/12 1981/6 1982/7 2027/16 2027/18 2027/19 2027/20 2027/21 2027/23 2028/1 2028/3 2028/11 2028/13 2028/14 2028/15 cast [1] 2052/5 casual [1] 2098/11 caught [6] 1975/11 2010/3 2010/3 2010/5 2100/21 2101/3 caused [4] 1936/3 1954/11 2020/6

2038/3 causing [1] 1955/17 caution [1] 2093/24 CCP [1] 2105/10 cell [13] 1994/14 1996/23 1999/4 2005/23 2016/24 2016/24 2016/25 2017/4 2017/6 2017/9 2052/5 2052/14 2057/20 Central [1] 1974/4 certain [3] 2031/16 2031/17 2063/6 certainly [4] 1975/8 2005/23 2037/16 2057/1 cetera [1] 2074/13 Cewei [2] 1946/19 1947/13 chain [1] 2096/24 chains [1] 1994/5 chambers [1] 2121/23 chance [3] 1937/7 1993/1 2076/24 change [1] 1934/24 changing [2] 1974/21 1974/23 Chaohang [1] 2052/22 Chaohong [4] 2042/10 2042/11 2099/4 2116/1 Chaohong Chen [2] 2042/10 2042/11 charge [18] 1950/19 1954/2 1954/3 1954/15 1965/16 2008/7 2024/20 2033/13 2037/19 2053/25 2054/6 2059/14 2062/7 2062/25 2063/11 2068/19 2068/23 2114/21 charged [11] 1939/21 1968/10 2020/9 2032/16 2032/17 2032/18 2037/24 2070/7 2100/21 2109/20 2112/22 charges [9] 1940/9 1940/10 1940/11 1953/14 1953/20 1953/24 1964/7 1987/19 2037/18 chart [12] 1973/4 1974/1 1974/24 1996/15 1996/17 2003/24 2032/24 2045/9 2083/18 2087/21 2088/2 2101/7 charts [4] 2033/1 2082/17 2087/17 2087/17 chats [1] 2016/11 cheated [1] 2106/25 check [18] 1969/11 1976/22 1979/12 1979/13 1979/15 1981/6 1982/6 1993/2 1993/3 1993/4 1993/5 1995/16 2002/8 2005/2 2028/14 2090/24 2091/4 2091/4 checked [1] 1939/2 checking [7] 1980/1 1980/16 1980/19 1981/1 1981/9 1981/9 2115/19 checks [1] 2002/8 CHEN [55] 1933/9 1933/16 1939/23 1953/15 1953/17 1954/15 1964/12 1964/21 1965/1 1965/7 1966/16 1968/4 1984/21 1984/24 2000/10 2011/3 2011/23 2012/12 2019/16 2037/6 2037/20 2042/10 2042/11 2048/19 2048/20 2048/20 2049/19 2052/22 2053/3 2053/3 2053/3 2053/6 2053/23 2053/25 2054/13 2054/15 2054/25 2055/7 2055/20 2057/19 2058/8 2059/11 2060/8 2062/7 2063/18 2065/6 2065/7 2065/14 2065/25 2066/10 2066/11 2066/11 2070/2 2099/4 2116/1 Chen Chaohang [1] 2052/22 Chen Chaohong [1] 2099/4

Chen's [3] 1953/18 2024/10 2060/9 chief [3] 1966/13 2064/19 2064/21 child [1] 1938/21 child's [1] 2028/17 children [3] 1951/3 1968/2 1986/14 China [160] 1938/3 1938/10 1938/13 1938/14 1938/16 1938/20 1938/24 1939/7 1940/19 1941/1 1941/24 1942/15 1943/2 1943/6 1944/3 1944/7 1945/1 1945/7 1945/8 1945/25 1946/24 1947/4 1947/5 1947/8 1947/12 1948/15 1949/2 1949/8 1949/22 1951/2 1952/3 1952/7 1952/11 1952/20 1952/25 1955/11 1955/12 1955/22 1956/6 1956/14 1957/9 1957/13 1958/3 1959/16 1960/2 1960/5 1962/21 1963/17 1969/8 1969/21 1971/13 1972/12 1973/12 1974/16 1975/5 1975/24 1976/4 1978/6 1979/19 1979/22 1979/22 1981/7 1983/4 1983/10 1983/18 1984/11 1984/17 1987/6 1987/15 1987/25 1988/8 1989/7 1995/23 1997/9 1997/13 1997/18 1997/23 1997/24 1997/25 1998/1 1998/4 1998/6 1998/8 1998/16 1999/22 2003/10 2003/16 2003/21 2004/13 2005/9 2005/17 2009/13 2010/18 2011/1 2011/7 2011/15 2011/17 2011/19 2012/20 2012/24 2013/23 2013/24 2018/3 2018/9 2019/2 2019/19 2020/1 2020/3 2020/7 2020/23 2022/4 2025/1 2026/17 2030/25 2031/3 2031/6 2044/17 2045/18 2045/19 2046/9 2047/8 2056/10 2056/12 2056/13 2056/18 2056/19 2060/16 2070/16 2070/16 2071/9 2071/22 2072/8 2073/4 2075/7 2075/20 2076/3 2079/11 2081/7 2082/3 2083/20 2083/20 2086/22 2089/21 2099/10 2100/6 2100/23 2101/8 2101/20 2101/21 2101/23 2102/20 2105/3 2110/10 2110/19 2110/22 2111/17 2111/18 2116/18 2117/16 2118/2 Chinese [247] Chinese-speaking [1] 1992/7 choice [3] 2108/19 2109/1 2109/1 choices [2] 2108/18 2109/6 chose [1] 2001/5 circle [5] 2009/19 2009/19 2010/1 2083/23 2100/19 circumstances [5] 2063/14 2063/16 2099/9 2115/13 2115/18 circumstantial [18] 1997/19 2011/20 2011/21 2011/23 2011/25 2012/6 2012/9 2012/21 2013/14 2015/18 2018/5 2019/20 2019/24 2024/13 2024/17 2047/9 2110/1 2110/5 citizen [1] 2070/22 citizens [3] 1987/4 2022/14 2105/23 City [1] 2046/4 civil [4] 2023/4 2062/17 2062/19 2111/11 claim [3] 2110/5 2113/2 2113/4 claimed [1] 1960/19 clarification [1] 2086/3 clarified [1] 1947/6

```
clarify [3] 1984/7 2073/15 2109/10
clarifying [1] 2026/16
clean [1] 1935/22
clear [32] 1941/21 1948/20 1952/18
1953/24 1959/3 1960/2 1960/12
1963/4 1978/7 1978/22 1985/20
1986/10 1992/19 2005/13 2009/15
2026/4 2026/19 2027/19 2033/15
2034/20 2044/16 2049/11 2058/16
2068/14 2070/1 2073/21 2074/25
2087/13 2098/18 2107/9 2112/14
2115/14
clear-cut [1] 1960/12
clearly [23] 1946/8 1946/8 1955/14
1956/24 1983/19 1983/20 1984/1
2008/21 2008/22 2037/14 2055/17
2057/10 2063/13 2074/24 2083/9
2083/22 2087/17 2088/5 2094/6
2095/5 2099/8 2102/2 2110/7
clerk [2] 2120/2 2121/12
client [50] 1974/25 1975/3 1975/4
1991/14 2026/2 2040/1 2048/17
2048/22 2049/15 2049/19 2049/22
2052/19 2053/2 2053/4 2053/4
2053/10 2053/12 2054/9 2054/14
2055/2 2055/8 2055/18 2055/23
2056/1 2056/7 2057/1 2057/4 2057/9
2057/24 2058/8 2058/8 2058/10
2058/11 2059/11 2065/15 2067/3
2067/7 2067/11 2069/7 2069/25
2070/3 2073/22 2075/8 2075/19
2095/8 2096/14 2098/23 2099/1
2100/3 2107/10
client's [5] 2050/3 2051/8 2052/24
2073/22 2107/9
clients [5] 1974/20 1975/6 1978/6
1993/8 2069/7
clip [1] 1961/9
close [6] 1962/11 2030/23 2038/6
2071/3 2109/12 2115/11
closed [2] 2115/13 2116/4
closely [1] 1940/4
closing [6] 1937/16 1984/25 2046/20
2067/21 2069/6 2069/20
co [9] 1940/17 1942/14 1945/9 1945/13
1957/6 1958/16 1967/20 1967/22
1970/13
co-conspirator [2] 1942/14 1945/9
co-conspirator's [1] 1970/13
co-conspirators [6] 1940/17 1945/13
1957/6 1958/16 1967/20 1967/22
coconspirators [5] 1981/4 2120/15
2120/24 2121/6 2121/20
code [4] 2000/3 2000/4 2050/19 2120/6
coded [1] 1984/5
coerce [5] 1940/18 1948/14 1952/20
1955/12 1956/6
coincidence [5] 1981/12 2091/7 2094/7
2118/21 2118/25
collapse [1] 1963/13
collapsing [1] 1963/13
colleague [3] 2041/12 2112/22 2115/9
colleagues [1] 1991/6
collect [5] 1976/12 1992/7 1994/22
2104/17 2117/22
collected [2] 1976/6 1976/13
collecting [2] 1976/7 2117/24
```

collection [1]52106/17 collections [1] 2099/7 college [3] 1943/16 1976/10 1976/11 college-aged [2] 1943/16 1976/10 combined [1] 1982/22 coming [8] 1936/4 1971/22 1981/23 1986/5 1999/13 2050/24 2100/23 2104/13 commerce [3] 1954/6 2037/23 2037/25 commissar [3] 1941/1 1966/13 1970/5 commission [7] 1976/16 1977/18 1992/1 2004/15 2034/10 2035/2 2036/17 commissioned [1] 1962/19 commit [9] 1953/7 1953/9 1954/14 1954/18 1965/17 2059/6 2101/19 2113/6 2113/21 commitments [1] 2108/7 committed [6] 1953/3 1953/8 1965/14 2063/6 2069/2 2113/22 Committee [2] 1974/5 2110/14 committing [2] 2015/16 2070/8 common [17] 1953/3 1953/22 1985/2 1989/11 2005/15 2012/13 2015/16 2019/14 2032/7 2033/7 2034/4 2072/12 2088/17 2109/15 2109/17 2112/15 2118/25 communicate [3] 2076/20 2080/4 2081/17 communicating [5] 2074/25 2081/22 2081/23 2094/19 2118/22 communication [13] 1958/21 2020/15 2020/16 2075/7 2077/7 2080/2 2081/9 2082/16 2083/3 2083/5 2094/23 2096/13 2096/21 communications [29] 2004/9 2040/16 2074/6 2074/24 2077/2 2077/2 2077/6 2077/21 2077/22 2078/4 2081/20 2082/10 2082/11 2082/19 2083/8 2087/24 2093/19 2094/13 2095/17 2095/19 2095/22 2097/7 2097/15 2098/11 2098/16 2098/17 2100/13 2102/10 2103/11 Communist [4] 1962/9 2070/15 2070/18 2070/21 company [30] 1995/11 1995/15 1997/9 2001/14 2001/15 2001/21 2002/3 2002/6 2002/10 2002/12 2002/13 2003/4 2003/10 2003/13 2003/14 2003/14 2003/16 2004/4 2004/10 2004/14 2004/25 2005/18 2026/7 2026/10 2040/25 2040/25 2041/2 2041/2 2090/24 2103/16 compare [1] 2098/9 comparison [3] 2097/6 2097/11 2098/18 comparisons [1] 2099/11 compartment [1] 2050/3 compelling [2] 2087/17 2087/18 compensated [1] 2084/15 compensation [2] 1964/24 2098/4 compiled [1] 2081/2 complete [1] 2088/3 completed [2] 2113/5 2114/3 completely [6] 1976/7 2039/20 2042/16 2047/19 2111/1 2113/17 complex [3] 2105/9 2106/1 2115/15 complicated [2] 1994/14 2103/22

comprehend [1] 2115/16 comprehensive [1] 2089/24 computer [2] 1933/25 1936/10 computer-aided [1] 1933/25 conceal [2] 2016/18 2016/21 concealing [2] 1981/19 1981/20 conceded [3] 2038/9 2113/9 2116/6 concept [2] 2121/1 2121/2 concern [1] 2006/9 concerned [5] 1951/8 1951/10 1959/22 1963/25 2067/11 conclude [3] 1946/14 2037/17 2045/16 conclusion [4] 2012/18 2091/23 2103/25 2109/18 condemn [1] 1993/25 condition [1] 1959/19 conditions [2] 1959/22 1959/23 conduct [8] 1939/12 1977/19 2019/10 2019/12 2035/2 2108/18 2108/21 2116/1 conducted [6] 1967/14 1969/19 1972/9 1975/15 1988/5 1988/7 conducting [5] 1942/3 1943/23 1976/8 1976/17 1977/12 conduit [1] 1987/21 confidence [1] 1977/17 confirm [5] 1934/10 1939/4 2085/24 2114/3 2114/4 confirmation [1] 2114/10 confirmed [4] 1934/7 1942/18 1972/17 2070/14 confirms [1] 2020/8 confused [2] 1961/4 2110/24 confusions [1] 2103/20 Congying [17] 1939/9 1950/16 1951/5 1960/12 1960/15 1962/23 1966/25 1967/24 1984/20 1984/23 1985/5 1985/6 1986/11 1987/8 1988/23 1989/8 2111/13 Congying Zheng [6] 1939/9 1950/16 1951/5 1987/8 1988/23 1989/8 connection [5] 1945/12 1949/13 1979/7 2018/21 2035/8 conscious [3] 1984/23 1984/24 2115/10 consciousness [1] 2018/1 consequences [2] 2025/9 2089/3 consider [13] 1982/16 1991/9 1991/16 2000/6 2000/13 2011/24 2012/22 2033/8 2047/21 2066/16 2066/16 2100/18 2102/17 consideration [2] 1984/22 2021/24 considered [2] 2070/23 2088/6 considering [3] 2000/10 2000/14 2067/4 consistent [3] 1989/10 2026/1 2114/25 conspiracies [6] 2063/2 2063/7 2063/9 2112/2 2112/23 2115/2 conspiracy [38] 1952/23 1953/1 1954/14 1954/16 1954/22 1962/16 1964/5 1964/11 1987/12 2005/16 2008/16 2009/21 2011/5 2052/12 2052/15 2056/8 2059/7 2061/6 2063/5 2070/8 2081/4 2111/14 2112/7 2112/8 2112/17 2112/25 2112/25 2113/4 2113/11 2113/15 2114/10 2114/11 2116/15 2116/20 2117/10 2117/20 2118/13 2118/18

conspirator [2] 1942/14 1945/9 conspirator's [1] 1970/13 conspirators [10] 1940/17 1942/23 1944/22 1945/13 1947/21 1956/20 1957/6 1958/16 1967/20 1967/22 conspired [3] 1953/6 1953/9 1965/16 construction [1] 2030/18 consular [2] 1966/18 1966/23 consultation [1] 2096/11 consulted [1] 2096/21 contact [29] 1940/25 1970/12 2026/16 2058/7 2071/24 2079/10 2079/11 2081/7 2081/8 2081/19 2082/2 2084/5 2084/7 2087/9 2087/20 2088/4 2088/6 2088/7 2088/9 2088/10 2088/12 2088/24 2089/10 2090/23 2091/11 2096/8 2097/1 2098/12 2118/12 contacted [1] 1992/13 contacting [1] 1945/24 contacts [2] 1971/23 2077/25 contains [1] 2090/1 content [1] 1999/6 contention [1] 1996/18 contents [1] 1952/13 context [3] 2025/16 2027/8 2028/1 CONTI [4] 1933/18 1995/1 1999/5 2006/1 continuation [1] 2083/12 continue [10] 1949/4 1990/20 2024/7 2024/18 2043/8 2049/9 2051/21 2056/1 2076/12 2114/11 continued [17] 1949/6 1949/10 1951/22 1952/4 1970/19 1986/16 1988/13 2002/15 2022/21 2041/14 2050/4 2061/8 2079/21 2092/6 2101/11 2107/23 2114/12 continuing [12] 1949/17 1952/1 1971/1 1987/1 2003/1 2042/1 2062/1 2080/1 2093/1 2108/1 2114/9 2116/20 contract [2] 2077/24 2094/15 contractual [1] 1964/23 contrary [1] 2039/21 control [8] 1966/20 1967/1 2006/13 2006/15 2007/7 2008/9 2008/19 2071/13 controlled [3] 1978/10 2006/23 2070/20 controlling [1] 2070/18 convenience [1] 1981/19 conversation [5] 1943/4 1998/2 1999/21 2008/18 2011/14 conversations [8] 1998/12 1998/19 2011/17 2054/13 2055/6 2055/8 2059/12 2103/11 convert [1] 2074/21 convey [1] 1945/24 conveyed [3] 1943/25 2044/2 2044/8 convict [4] 2029/21 2040/20 2046/21 2115/1 convicted [2] 2037/21 2100/21 conviction [5] 2018/8 2046/24 2047/14 2051/24 2051/24 convince [6] 1948/25 1957/9 1983/4 2054/22 2099/18 2099/18 convinced [1] 2099/19 cooperating [1] 2019/8 cooperation [3] 2051/14 2051/16 2051/18

coordinated [4] 24 59/5 cop [3] 1992/17 2010/22 2019/6 copies [1] 2056/23 cops [1] 2013/20 corner [2] 2082/14 2083/15 correct [10] 1935/6 1935/7 2006/10 2009/5 2021/11 2021/18 2036/14 2069/14 2097/21 2109/25 corresponded [1] 1996/20 corruption [2] 2013/25 2094/21 counsel [11] 2007/14 2073/22 2104/8 2109/5 2111/15 2112/24 2113/8 2115/3 2116/9 2117/9 2118/6 Counsels [1] 2069/5 count [28] 1954/3 1954/14 1954/17 1955/1 1955/2 1955/3 1962/13 1964/5 1964/9 1964/9 1964/11 1964/11 1964/13 1965/7 1965/18 1965/21 1968/8 1968/11 1968/21 1974/12 1984/19 1987/8 1987/16 2011/5 2011/5 2067/10 2119/25 2119/25 Count One [1] 2119/25 Count Three [1] 2119/25 counters [1] 1942/5 country [2] 2073/11 2105/24 counts [9] 1989/12 2036/20 2037/15 2055/4 2055/4 2056/6 2056/10 2067/9 2119/24 County [1] 1992/11 couple [9] 1980/20 1994/23 2020/7 2023/7 2025/3 2025/15 2091/15 2104/13 2119/2 course [14] 1948/13 1953/18 1954/10 1958/9 1959/3 1961/20 1962/15 1999/3 2008/14 2018/25 2025/25 2038/3 2081/24 2117/17 Court's [2] 2113/12 2113/13 courthouse [2] 1933/3 1992/11 courtroom [8] 1936/17 1989/23 1990/12 2024/4 2065/23 2092/1 2093/5 2105/9 cover [3] 1958/25 2073/1 2073/1 covered [2] 2096/14 2104/7 covert [6] 2039/4 2039/10 2039/10 2039/11 2040/4 2047/10 CR [1] 1933/2 CRAIG [1] 1933/15 creates [2] 1998/7 2019/19 credit [5] 1980/23 2030/19 2030/20 2030/21 2064/20 crew [1] 2083/20 crime [27] 1944/8 1953/7 1953/8 1953/10 1955/6 1965/20 1996/11 2015/16 2027/21 2037/9 2037/9 2037/9 2037/12 2050/20 2050/22 2059/7 2061/5 2061/5 2069/3 2070/8 2082/8 2101/19 2111/25 2113/21 2113/22 2113/24 2114/3 crimes [5] 1939/21 1953/4 1953/4 2044/17 2063/6 criminal [20] 1933/9 1992/12 1992/14 2010/25 2022/19 2023/4 2030/23 2036/23 2054/4 2058/1 2064/1 2066/10 2070/4 2091/5 2091/6 2110/3 2111/4 2112/6 2112/17 2113/15 criminality [2] 1996/9 2029/16 criminals [1] 2100/17 critical [10] 1955/19 1957/1 1957/3

2013/23 2015/25 2020/2 2020/5 2040/2 2109/14 2117/20 cross [2] 1998/25 2044/8 cross-examination [2] 1998/25 2044/8 crossing [1] 2108/25 crucial [2] 2093/12 2107/8 crumples [1] 2057/24 crying [2] 1939/1 1952/15 culture [1] 1983/7 Customs [1] 2100/2 cut [9] 1940/23 1960/12 2007/2 2007/3 2025/2 2081/14 2082/1 2082/5

2108/20 D dai [8] 2055/12 2055/12 2055/15 2055/15 2055/16 2099/5 2099/5 2099/10 Daily [2] 1975/24 2020/3 danger [1] 1983/10 dangerous [3] 1938/15 1947/10 2100/14 data [12] 1978/7 1996/23 1999/4 2005/24 2016/25 2017/7 2074/9 2074/12 2074/20 2074/21 2081/1 2083/13 database [5] 1975/22 1977/6 1977/8 2034/19 2036/9 databases [3] 1956/16 1967/17 2034/19 date [8] 1978/3 1993/16 2082/9 2082/24 2083/25 2083/25 2084/1 2090/14 dates [1] 1941/10 daughter [21] 1938/16 1938/23 1939/2 1943/16 1944/15 1944/15 1947/12 1947/12 1947/14 1949/8 1949/14 1949/16 1949/25 1963/1 1963/24 1964/1 1964/2 1976/10 1989/6 2040/8 2042/19 daylight [1] 1962/2 DEA [5] 1977/24 2017/17 2017/18 2017/19 2033/14 deal [14] 1993/7 2016/23 2028/13 2035/15 2050/14 2050/14 2050/15 2050/17 2051/13 2051/13 2063/14 2063/16 2064/17 2081/15 deals [2] 2058/14 2063/1 dealt [1] 2056/10 debate [1] 2120/3 debt [9] 1976/7 1976/12 1992/7 1994/22 2071/23 2099/7 2106/17 2117/22 2117/25 deceit [2] 2010/19 2045/23 deceived [3] 2011/9 2024/15 2027/3 December [7] 1944/14 1968/7 1979/17 2004/19 2082/18 2083/8 2088/1 December 13 [1] 1979/17 December 2016 [2] 1944/14 2082/18 December 2019 [1] 1968/7 December 29 [1] 2083/8 December 4 [1] 2004/19 deception [1] 2028/5 deceptions [1] 2106/2 decide [2] 2018/6 2062/2 deciding [2] 2012/10 2065/24 deck [1] 1960/22 declare [2] 2032/12 2033/2

1981/7 198**1**/13**22**058/9 depositing [3] 1981/16 2029/10 2029/14 deposits [4] 1980/19 1981/1 1982/14 2027/13 describe [2] 1963/10 1963/23 described [9] 1936/10 1952/17 1961/23 1963/20 1973/18 1985/13 2010/15 2017/7 2117/19 describes [1] 2045/11 description [1] 1979/23 descriptions [1] 1982/9 design [1] 2112/15 Despite [1] 1942/1 detail [5] 1969/6 1974/19 2001/10 2037/4 2119/22 detailed [10] 1943/4 1967/19 1988/14 2015/21 2015/24 2016/13 2016/18 2016/19 2117/6 2117/7 details [1] 2016/4 detective [33] 2008/5 2072/15 2076/20 2079/6 2080/7 2080/12 2081/5 2081/8 2082/3 2084/5 2084/9 2086/19 2088/13 2088/15 2088/25 2089/22 2090/21 2091/9 2093/21 2093/23 2094/5 2095/2 2095/7 2095/9 2095/13 2095/15 2095/18 2095/18 2096/3 2097/1 2097/2 2098/17 2106/5 Detective McMahon [8] 2080/7 2081/5 2081/8 2082/3 2088/15 2088/25 2090/21 2091/9 detector [1] 2006/22 determine [3] 2036/7 2069/1 2103/21 determined [1] 2055/19 DHS [3] 1978/7 1978/12 1978/16 die [3] 1944/10 1959/13 1959/14 Dietz [2] 2021/2 2021/5 difference [5] 2054/3 2062/16 2091/1 2091/2 2120/10 different [22] 1935/23 1938/3 1953/1 1953/2 1974/2 1975/5 1981/3 1981/5 1981/8 1982/5 1982/7 1982/8 2028/11 2030/3 2030/4 2031/14 2039/16 2051/4 2101/16 2101/17 2112/2 2112/5 differs [1] 2113/13 difficult [6] 1991/1 1991/12 1991/13 1997/3 2062/13 2115/15 difficulties [1] 2029/9 difficulty [1] 2029/18 diminishing [1] 2087/18 diplomatic [1] 1966/18 diplomats [1] 1966/22 direct [12] 1940/25 1948/16 1956/24 1997/17 2011/14 2011/25 2012/7 2024/12 2071/13 2073/7 2109/23 2110/2 directed [7] 1940/19 1946/6 1946/14 1965/23 1999/24 2112/5 2116/7 directing [3] 1942/12 2114/6 2118/23 direction [20] 1939/15 1943/7 1953/25 1965/2 1965/5 1965/10 1965/19 1966/20 1966/25 1967/9 1967/12 1967/18 1967/24 1968/6 1968/23 1969/4 2006/10 2010/2 2071/13 2085/6 directions [1] 2112/11 directly [9] 1943/8 1958/10 2039/8

2043/15 2081/15 2095/19 2116/20 2118/15 2120/8 director [4] 2022/3 2022/7 2022/8 2022/15 dirt [1] 2057/25 disagreement [1] 2120/21 disappear [2] 1944/8 1944/10 Discipline [1] 1974/5 disclosed [1] 2105/2 discloses [1] 2014/13 disconnected [1] 1963/18 discover [2] 2093/22 2094/7 discovered [1] 2102/6 discrete [1] 1962/15 discuss [5] 1941/18 1953/15 1965/21 2026/17 2053/13 discussed [8] 1945/14 1945/16 1946/4 1997/2 2009/9 2013/11 2025/13 2070/16 discussing [2] 1985/12 2003/6 discussion [6] 2002/7 2008/15 2017/15 2067/1 2109/22 2111/21 discussions [1] 2048/25 disguise [1] 2003/22 disparaging [1] 1950/5 dispenser [2] 1960/22 2057/4 display [2] 2072/18 2093/14 displayed [2] 2095/6 2099/23 displays [1] 2078/3 disposed [1] 1978/11 dispute [8] 1934/16 1940/13 1965/22 1966/15 1968/13 1968/17 1968/20 2009/15 disputed [7] 1994/2 1996/1 1997/6 1997/7 1997/11 2016/5 2034/13 disregard [3] 2047/19 2049/13 2049/13 dissected [1] 1993/24 distance [2] 1963/17 2009/8 distant [1] 1963/16 distress [8] 1954/12 1955/17 1959/4 1960/9 1961/21 2038/5 2038/23 2044/21 distressing [1] 1959/17 distributed [1] 1978/11 DISTRICT [5] 1933/1 1933/1 1933/10 1933/14 2021/3 DNA [1] 2051/2 docketed [1] 2122/1 doctor [3] 1945/20 1946/22 1959/12 document [13] 1941/16 2052/8 2052/25 2076/25 2077/1 2094/3 2095/4 2100/2 2103/1 2111/15 2111/16 2117/2 2121/15 documents [5] 1978/9 2018/20 2021/10 2021/18 2103/21 Doe [1] 2120/3 dog [1] 2069/10 DOJ [2] 2025/7 2025/11 dollar [1] 1980/9 dollars [2] 1980/17 2098/5 done [16] 1934/8 1934/9 1959/19 1959/25 1987/20 2019/15 2024/20 2030/1 2036/5 2046/15 2055/13 2066/14 2074/2 2074/6 2081/2 2116/13 door [36] 1936/20 1936/22 1938/18 1938/18 1947/22 1950/20 1950/20 1950/21 1950/22 1951/9 1951/13

door... [25] 1951/13 1951/18 1960/21 1960/23 1961/25 1962/3 1985/16 1985/16 1988/25 1989/2 1989/5 2042/3 2042/4 2043/23 2049/23 2057/3 2057/4 2057/5 2057/6 2058/5 2058/16 2058/18 2058/20 2062/5 2115/20 doors [1] 2067/16 dot [2] 2073/12 2073/12 dot-gov [1] 2073/12 dot-organization [1] 2073/12 double [1] 2078/23 doubt [24] 1936/13 1940/11 1953/14 1987/19 1992/5 1993/14 1994/18 1996/2 1998/7 2019/19 2037/17 2037/22 2040/9 2040/15 2040/19 2044/14 2044/20 2054/23 2062/16 2071/8 2071/12 2095/24 2098/23 2103/18 down [27] 1936/14 1940/4 1941/18 1945/9 1951/6 1951/11 1963/21 1971/13 1974/11 1982/13 1986/9 2002/9 2037/4 2049/24 2057/21 2057/22 2057/23 2058/19 2059/13 2059/21 2060/4 2066/9 2067/13 2077/24 2078/9 2108/19 2112/12 dozens [1] 2104/13 Dr. [1] 1946/22 Dr. Li [1] 1946/22 dragnet [2] 1976/1 2021/9 draw [4] 1951/9 2070/2 2114/2 2114/3 drive [6] 1935/18 1935/25 2055/24 2058/8 2084/14 2117/18 driven [1] 2050/3 driver [1] 1945/11 driver's [1] 1995/6 drives [3] 2058/10 2058/22 2060/12 driveway [4] 1950/20 1960/20 2117/15 2117/16 driving [2] 2053/12 2084/15 dropped [1] 1947/20 drove [3] 1950/17 1960/12 2111/23 Drug [1] 1977/24 DSS [1] 1966/21 due [2] 2030/20 2066/6 dumb [1] 2097/23 Dunkin [1] 2030/16 duty [1] 2047/20 DVD [1] 1952/14

D

e-mail [29] 1942/9 1971/8 1971/24 1974/25 1975/12 1975/13 1975/15 1975/20 1979/3 1995/12 1997/23 2000/2 2000/20 2073/2 2073/2 2073/5 2073/9 2073/9 2073/13 2073/13 2074/11 2075/6 2077/6 2100/12 2116/24 2118/9 2118/19 2121/23 2121/24 e-mailed [1] 1949/11 e-mails [3] 2000/17 2074/24 2116/25 early [5] 1942/2 1956/3 1969/25 2025/17 2025/18 earned [3] 1982/3 1982/17 1982/20 earnings [2] 1982/21 1982/23 easily [3] 1958/2 2029/2 2105/25 East [1] 1933/14

EASTERN [3] 14963/1 1933/14 2021/3 easy [1] 2067/18 eat [1] 1963/14 effect [3] 2017/7 2022/4 2022/9 effectively [1] 2116/6 effort [8] 1949/24 1961/11 1971/13 1986/1 1997/12 2000/21 2031/11 2037/3 efforts [6] 1942/12 1949/9 1952/4 1952/10 2037/11 2113/18 eight [3] 1995/16 2004/17 2005/1 either [14] 1934/23 1944/7 1954/13 1995/23 2008/16 2020/22 2021/1 2044/12 2054/25 2055/8 2056/7 2056/9 2091/9 2099/19 elderly [5] 1938/12 1944/23 1945/21 1948/23 1959/9 element [6] 1959/8 1960/14 1961/18 1968/11 1968/12 2038/17 elements [7] 1954/3 1954/16 1954/25 1962/14 1964/13 1965/8 2038/6 elicited [1] 2007/11 eliminated [1] 2083/10 ELMO [1] 2072/22 elsewhere [1] 2026/11 email [12] 1933/23 1954/24 1970/8 1970/9 1970/10 1970/16 2004/12 2004/19 2033/18 2080/5 2080/6 2080/7 emails [3] 2005/11 2010/9 2011/17 Embassy [4] 1996/24 1999/24 2005/22 2009/20 embezzled [2] 1995/20 2027/1 embezzlement [4] 1997/10 2013/24 2020/9 2094/21 Emily [3] 2080/2 2080/2 2081/2 Emily Hsu [3] 2080/2 2080/2 2081/2 emitting [1] 2017/11 emoji [3] 1939/4 1963/24 1964/3 emotional [8] 1954/12 1955/17 1959/4 1960/9 1961/21 2038/5 2038/23 2044/21 emotionally [1] 2010/17 emphasize [1] 2069/2 emphatic [1] 1946/6 employed [1] 2048/21 employee [1] 1965/4 encountered [1] 2007/20 encourage [1] 2110/11 enforcement [7] 1943/22 1975/9 1977/24 2014/2 2017/13 2017/14 2025/21 engage [4] 1956/24 1962/16 1964/5 2070/10 engaged [3] 1955/9 1957/1 2118/7 engaging [1] 2068/23 engender [1] 2046/24 English [3] 2013/11 2075/24 2081/1 ensure [3] 1945/21 1946/15 1957/3 enter [2] 1989/10 1989/12 entered [1] 1970/16 entering [1] 2100/23 enters [4] 1936/17 1990/12 2024/4 2093/5 entire [7] 1959/6 1959/17 1960/24 1968/9 2020/23 2039/4 2088/13 entirely [2] 2026/1 2118/21

entity [3] 1973/3 1973/7 1973/8

entries [1] 2083/7 Entry [1] 1971/16 Eric [37] 1943/8 1957/16 1975/3 1979/23 1995/12 2003/16 2003/18 2003/19 2003/23 2004/6 2004/9 2004/12 2004/13 2004/19 2013/20 2015/7 2015/14 2020/25 2026/13 2026/19 2027/19 2032/6 2039/11 2043/16 2082/1 2084/13 2087/20 2089/11 2089/16 2089/19 2093/20 2093/25 2094/1 2098/16 2104/25 2105/1 2110/25 Eric Gallowitz [6] 2027/19 2032/6 2039/11 2093/20 2093/25 2094/1 Eric Yan [12] 1943/8 1995/12 2026/13 2043/16 2082/1 2084/13 2087/20 2089/11 2089/16 2089/19 2098/16 2105/1 Eric's [1] 1975/4 escalated [4] 1942/12 1944/21 1950/12 1958/1 escalating [1] 1962/5 escalation [1] 1963/4 ESQ [9] 1933/13 1933/15 1933/16 1933/16 1933/18 1933/18 1933/19 1933/20 1933/21 essence [1] 1999/22 essential [1] 2117/20 essentially [8] 1965/3 1974/7 2045/3 2070/19 2112/4 2112/5 2113/8 2115/6 established [2] 2012/14 2012/17 estimate [1] 2104/2 et [2] 1933/6 2074/13 et cetera [1] 2074/13 etc [1] 2080/9 evacuate [2] 2105/22 2105/24 evaluate [1] 2027/8 evasion [1] 2032/17 eve [1] 1978/6 evening [1] 1937/1 event [2] 1993/10 2099/1 events [6] 1940/6 1940/8 1940/9 1952/17 2025/19 2089/3 eventually [6] 1978/20 2049/23 2050/5 2050/5 2050/15 2050/23 everyday [3] 2029/19 2030/14 2036/25 evidence [221] evidently [1] 2056/23 evil [1] 2029/15 exact [4] 1985/18 2016/20 2028/20 2028/22 exactly [34] 1939/17 1941/19 1941/22 1943/25 1953/23 1960/25 1968/25 1971/3 1972/14 1974/8 1977/14 1983/1 1984/8 1984/14 1984/15 1985/11 1985/22 1987/20 1988/10 1988/22 1989/8 1994/1 2005/13 2014/5 2014/23 2016/14 2019/9 2020/10 2023/3 2035/13 2036/12 2040/14 2058/1 2098/1 examination [2] 1998/25 2044/8 examinations [1] 1935/2 examine [3] 2037/3 2053/16 2053/16 examined [1] 2021/18 example [12] 1943/14 1976/9 2016/25 2018/22 2021/1 2026/4 2032/6 2036/24 2045/22 2048/6 2097/24 2113/19

Ε examples [1] 2036/21 exception [2] 1996/21 1996/22 exchange [5] 1976/21 1984/6 2001/19 2007/13 2096/3 exchanges [1] 2015/6 excuse [3] 1967/21 2054/14 2115/22 executed [1] 2044/19 exemplar [2] 2051/6 2051/7 exhibit [76] 1940/3 1940/4 1942/19 1970/8 1976/19 1992/25 1994/24 1995/7 1996/7 1998/21 1998/22 1998/23 2000/24 2001/18 2001/19 2002/1 2002/2 2002/11 2003/3 2003/12 2003/15 2004/11 2004/18 2004/24 2005/6 2013/8 2014/10 2014/17 2015/2 2015/10 2015/25 2018/16 2020/4 2026/5 2026/12 2029/8 2030/8 2030/8 2031/13 2034/16 2035/17 2035/17 2036/11 2042/24 2043/12 2052/13 2052/25 2069/23 2072/23 2072/24 2076/23 2077/1 2078/2 2078/5 2079/19 2080/1 2080/6 2080/19 2082/7 2082/12 2082/13 2082/13 2083/11 2083/12 2085/8 2085/8 2089/23 2093/11 2093/13 2093/18 2094/10 2097/10 2097/12 2098/3 2099/20 2099/21 Exhibit 0402U [1] 2099/21 Exhibit 0807F [1] 2097/12 Exhibit 0812C [1] 2098/3 Exhibit 0901-D [2] 2076/23 2077/1 Exhibit 103-A [1] 2013/8 Exhibit 107 [1] 2043/12 Exhibit 3007 [1] 2079/19 Exhibit 3034 [1] 2015/25 Exhibit 3047 [1] 2004/11 Exhibit 3056 [1] 2004/18 Exhibit 3061 [1] 2029/8 Exhibit 314 [1] 2015/2 Exhibit 317 [1] 1998/23 Exhibit 4004 [1] 2094/10 Exhibit 4019-B [1] 2015/10 Exhibit 4019B [1] 2093/13 Exhibit 403-A [1] 2005/6 Exhibit 407 [1] 2014/10 Exhibit 408-H [1] 2034/16 Exhibit 408-I [1] 2035/17 Exhibit 410 [1] 2014/17 Exhibit 434 [1] 2020/4 Exhibit 452 [1] 2031/13 Exhibit 805-B [4] 2003/3 2003/12 2003/15 2036/11 Exhibit 805B [3] 2001/19 2002/2 2002/11 Exhibit first [1] 1998/21 exhibits [12] 1934/7 1934/9 1934/12 1935/16 1935/25 1936/5 1937/14 1944/18 1945/5 1950/25 1994/23 2067/6 exist [1] 2075/11 existence [1] 2012/14 exists [1] 2112/17 Exit [1] 1971/16 exits [4] 1989/23 2023/23 2092/1 2119/16 expect [14] 1953/15 1954/15 1959/6 1961/21 1964/12 1964/21 1965/1

1965/7 196**5 162 1**968/4 1979/19 1984/21 2112/15 2113/19 expectation [3] 1959/4 1961/14 1961/20 expected [3] 1954/11 2038/4 2038/22 expenses [4] 2018/17 2018/20 2030/15 experience [3] 1952/19 2012/13 2105/7 experienced [1] 2019/6 expert [5] 1999/3 2074/20 2082/15 2104/19 2105/15 experts [5] 2020/22 2051/2 2051/4 2074/13 2104/12 explain [3] 1939/20 1973/5 2021/20 explained [9] 1957/15 1962/4 1965/20 1983/6 2003/25 2035/8 2036/6 2070/15 2111/7 explains [1] 2035/23 explanation [2] 1974/24 1986/7 explicitly [2] 2072/7 2098/8 exploited [1] 1944/23 expression [2] 2055/12 2111/13 extent [2] 1937/15 1953/16 extra [1] 2045/25 extra-legal [1] 2045/25 extract [2] 2074/9 2074/20 extradition [1] 2045/24 extremely [1] 2113/16 eyes [4] 1984/25 2115/12 2115/14 2116/4

F

face [4] 1958/5 2039/10 2039/14 2044/17 Facebook [5] 1938/22 1950/1 1963/1 2043/11 2043/11 fact [44] 1947/12 1956/11 1959/10 1968/14 1982/16 1982/20 1989/4 1993/8 1996/6 1997/4 1998/17 2006/24 2010/10 2012/14 2013/19 2016/23 2024/15 2029/17 2032/19 2033/9 2034/2 2034/3 2034/11 2034/13 2035/21 2042/8 2043/9 2044/19 2047/9 2049/13 2050/4 2050/16 2066/16 2068/10 2069/25 2085/3 2085/5 2089/6 2101/6 2101/11 2101/15 2101/17 2112/17 2116/14 fact-findings [1] 1997/4 facts [18] 1991/19 1993/18 1994/17 2012/15 2012/17 2013/23 2044/23 2049/6 2049/8 2049/16 2066/3 2066/6 2066/8 2101/2 2101/13 2101/16 2103/19 2110/21 failed [2] 1964/16 2071/16 fair [6] 2030/23 2053/17 2057/11 2064/12 2105/4 2114/2 fairly [1] 2057/1 faith [1] 2113/17 fake [1] 2004/6 fall [3] 1953/4 2042/21 2043/4 false [1] 2032/17 falsely [2] 1960/19 2082/3 families [4] 1938/6 1954/13 1963/9 2088/21 family [36] 1938/10 1941/2 1942/4 1944/3 1944/5 1945/15 1950/5 1950/9 1959/17 1959/21 1960/3 1960/13

1960/24 1961/11 1962/6 1962/24

1963/18 1971/17 1983/6 1983/7 1983/8 1983/10 1988/15 2010/18 2010/19 2045/2 2045/18 2046/1 2059/23 2063/15 2073/22 2099/6 2100/24 2111/17 2113/23 2118/16 family's [1] 1961/16 famous [2] 2082/6 2082/7 Fang [33] 1937/25 1938/2 1938/6 1938/17 1939/2 1939/6 1943/5 1947/1 1951/14 1951/16 1952/3 1952/8 1952/18 1952/20 1952/24 1953/23 1954/9 1954/12 1957/7 1960/16 1961/22 1961/23 1963/20 1963/23 1965/23 1969/20 1976/3 1977/23 1987/14 1987/25 1988/19 1995/4 2026/22 Fang's [15] 1938/7 1938/23 1938/24 1943/15 1945/2 1947/9 1952/5 1952/8 1963/1 1972/10 1976/10 1985/14 1985/24 1986/12 1988/24 far [5] 1935/2 1948/7 2034/18 2045/19 2090/21 fashion [1] 2040/4 fate [1] 2106/23 father [42] 1938/12 1938/14 1944/23 1945/1 1945/3 1945/19 1945/22 1945/23 1946/3 1946/18 1946/19 1946/23 1947/2 1947/10 1947/13 1947/17 1947/20 1947/21 1947/24 1948/3 1948/5 1949/7 1955/11 1955/18 1956/5 1956/5 1956/23 1957/2 1957/8 1957/11 1959/5 1959/9 1959/11 1959/18 1960/1 1960/5 1962/20 1967/16 1983/3 1984/3 1984/5 2045/1 father's [1] 1959/16 favor [5] 2019/21 2055/20 2055/24 2056/20 2063/18 favorable [1] 2107/10 Fax [1] 1933/23 FBI [14] 2022/3 2022/8 2022/14 2049/25 2050/10 2050/20 2052/4 2057/19 2058/20 2084/18 2085/4 2086/15 2086/21 2100/10 FBI Agent Bruno [1] 2086/21 FBI's [1] 2087/5 fear [5] 1960/4 1961/15 1961/23 1962/5 2044/20 feared [1] 1947/11 federal [3] 1993/12 2050/18 2050/18 fee [5] 1969/12 1979/10 1979/11 1979/24 2096/11 feedback [1] 2081/18 feelings [2] 1962/8 1989/1 fees [1] 2018/13 fellow [3] 2093/20 2093/23 2111/2 felt [5] 1950/6 1951/6 1961/23 1962/9 Feng [16] 1966/12 1975/5 1979/21 1980/10 1980/15 1983/17 1984/4 1984/13 1996/16 1996/22 2001/13 2005/7 2005/8 2005/11 2007/15 2101/9 Ferry [1] 2039/16 few [19] 1943/10 1949/21 1952/14 1971/23 1972/22 1998/14 2001/17 2015/21 2025/7 2037/18 2041/13

2044/23 2058/20 2069/9 2087/24

few... [4] 2104/10 2116/9 2117/13 2118/5 figure [8] 1946/2 1986/4 2022/6 2065/13 2073/14 2105/5 2105/13 2106/3 filing [1] 2032/17 fill [1] 2006/5 final [1] 2119/22 finally [9] 1950/11 1955/19 2034/6 2043/19 2056/15 2056/21 2097/13 2114/15 2118/5 finance [3] 2004/20 2005/11 2036/13 financial [3] 1995/11 1995/15 2004/25 financials [1] 1982/2 findings [2] 1969/15 1997/4 fine [9] 2069/12 2074/16 2090/6 2093/15 2094/11 2097/22 2099/22 2099/24 2121/25 fingerprints [1] 2051/3 finish [5] 2024/19 2046/20 2066/23 2085/2 2106/21 finishes [1] 2119/11 Finishing [1] 2104/3 Finning [9] 1977/23 1978/21 1979/6 2017/16 2017/20 2033/12 2033/16 2033/20 2033/24 firms [2] 2036/1 2036/3 first [50] 1934/20 1941/11 1953/5 1954/2 1954/5 1959/24 1960/20 1960/21 1960/21 1962/12 1964/14 1965/9 1968/11 1971/5 1973/21 1974/20 1980/2 1991/4 1991/4 1995/16 1998/21 2000/22 2001/18 2001/25 2005/2 2008/8 2012/23 2013/1 2020/8 2025/15 2026/15 2030/10 2037/22 2038/8 2038/25 2044/4 2045/12 2046/5 2053/5 2055/4 2063/11 2063/12 2070/11 2073/1 2082/20 2090/11 2094/7 2095/5 2105/11 2116/10 fish [1] 2064/6 five [12] 1980/9 1993/15 1993/15 1993/23 2004/21 2005/5 2005/13 2047/11 2052/17 2060/24 2100/11 2101/23 five-thousand-dollar [1] 1980/9 fixing [1] 2079/1 flag [2] 1975/7 1975/9 flash [1] 1935/25 flew [1] 1978/6 flight [4] 2046/9 2100/11 2101/8 2101/20 flood [1] 1938/24 flown [2] 1957/8 1983/3 fly [1] 1945/19 focus [11] 1940/12 1969/23 1991/8 1998/13 2011/20 2054/19 2076/8 2076/12 2080/11 2086/14 2108/21 focused [4] 1994/19 1994/21 2020/25 2080/10 focusing [2] 2085/16 2109/11 foil [1] 2017/10 folks [5] 1935/3 1936/14 2023/24 2119/7 2120/25 follow [9] 1935/1 1945/2 1953/18 1956/10 2006/10 2066/5 2066/19 2097/21 2113/13

followed [4] 5948/8 1948/4 1962/22 1978/4 follower [1] 1960/19 following [12] 1946/3 1951/22 1971/14 1980/17 1983/15 1984/2 2002/15 2041/14 2061/8 2087/19 2092/6 2107/23 footage [1] 2114/20 force [8] 1938/13 1941/23 1943/6 1952/10 1957/13 1971/13 1974/16 1984/17 forced [7] 1946/21 1947/3 1948/23 1959/16 1959/23 1960/1 1962/20 forcibly [1] 1967/16 foreign [24] 1953/6 1954/6 1959/2 1961/18 1964/8 1964/10 1965/2 1965/4 1965/5 1966/17 1966/20 2016/7 2019/12 2037/10 2037/23 2052/15 2068/20 2069/3 2070/9 2071/5 2105/18 2105/18 2106/25 2107/2 forever [1] 2063/24 forgot [2] 2001/2 2097/16 form [4] 2049/12 2055/14 2055/14 2116/24 formal [1] 1964/23 formats [1] 1981/6 former [6] 1940/21 1992/14 1992/17 2013/20 2014/2 2062/20 forth [15] 1955/22 1996/4 2011/5 2016/14 2018/23 2030/4 2042/4 2049/24 2052/7 2055/23 2063/15 2063/19 2100/6 2101/21 2101/22 Forty [1] 2105/7 forward [1] 1999/9 FOUO [1] 1978/12 four [15] 1939/21 1953/4 1953/14 1954/3 1972/11 1975/5 1981/3 1993/12 1993/19 2025/20 2025/20 2046/16 2060/24 2112/22 2116/17 Fourth [1] 1964/19 FOX [7] 1973/9 1973/11 1974/3 1974/8 1985/7 1985/8 2115/24 Foxhound [1] 2088/8 FOXHUNT [1] 2020/18 fraud [1] 2036/2 frequency [1] 2087/22 frequently [2] 1971/25 1972/5 friend [8] 1943/22 1975/4 1975/19 1978/22 2017/16 2033/18 2072/2 2110/25 friends [5] 1938/23 1950/2 1950/4 1950/7 1963/17 frightened [2] 1960/7 2045/10 front [16] 1950/20 1950/20 1951/9 1951/13 1958/5 1960/21 1974/4 1985/16 1989/4 1993/11 1996/17 2001/16 2039/14 2050/5 2073/20 2114/21 fugitive [2] 1972/19 1972/22 fugitives [2] 1976/1 2021/9 fulfill [1] 2018/7 fully [3] 2019/8 2062/13 2071/12 functions [1] 2100/8 fundamental [1] 2007/8 fundamentally [1] 2038/25 funds [1] 2033/3

furtherance [2] 1954/24 1965/14

G Gallowitz [19] 1957/16 1957/20 1957/22 1957/25 1975/20 1975/20 2008/15 2013/20 2015/7 2015/11 2021/1 2027/19 2032/6 2034/20 2039/11 2093/20 2093/25 2094/1 gangster [2] 2055/16 2115/6 gangsters [1] 2063/19 gap [1] 2095/23 gather [2] 1937/10 1955/24 gathered [2] 1945/13 1956/21 gathering [2] 1943/24 1994/4 geared [1] 1943/12 gender [1] 2001/2 general [6] 1964/17 1965/11 1968/14 1987/11 2068/21 2070/10 generally [1] 1953/11 generated [6] 2034/15 2034/16 2089/24 2090/12 2100/2 2120/10 GENNA [1] 1933/18 gentleman [2] 1975/12 2001/3 gentlemen [52] 1936/25 1937/13 1939/13 1941/14 1952/17 1961/13 1966/4 1967/7 1971/9 1987/17 1989/16 1990/23 1993/22 1997/3 2010/21 2011/10 2019/14 2023/18 2024/6 2041/8 2047/18 2049/4 2051/11 2054/18 2065/18 2066/15 2066/21 2068/4 2069/24 2073/9 2074/4 2074/22 2075/15 2077/5 2080/12 2080/23 2086/7 2086/23 2088/16 2089/8 2090/20 2091/20 2093/10 2096/18 2097/5 2100/1 2102/22 2104/23 2106/11 2106/23 2108/2 2108/13 girl [1] 1949/13 given [12] 1946/23 1946/25 1947/4 1971/22 1974/20 1974/23 2010/8 2016/11 2084/21 2098/13 2099/8 2105/25 glad [1] 1990/25 global [2] 1976/1 2021/9 glove [1] 2050/2 gmail.com [2] 1933/23 2073/10 goal [13] 1952/24 1953/3 1953/22 1956/5 1957/14 1958/2 1974/15 1987/13 1988/10 1988/22 1989/9 2110/3 2112/13 GOLDBERGER [15] 1933/19 1934/24 1935/5 1991/7 2039/13 2041/12 2047/24 2049/9 2065/20 2066/14 2066/19 2067/19 2098/25 2099/3 2123/6 gonna [2] 2003/6 2025/9 Gonzalez [4] 1934/11 1935/23 1936/11 1936/19 gov [1] 2073/12 government [364] Government Exhibit 0316 [1] 2082/13 Government Exhibit 0317 [1] 2083/12 Government Exhibit 0902-F [1] 2082/7 Government Exhibit 2029 [1] 2026/12 Government Exhibit 307 [1] 2080/6 Government Exhibit 4012 [1] 2089/23 Government Exhibit 403-I [2] 2030/8 2030/8 Government Exhibit 805-B [1] 2026/5

## G

government's [25] 1945/24 1949/9 1952/4 1952/10 1959/15 1966/5 1967/6 2014/5 2022/17 2024/16 2028/2 2028/8 2028/9 2034/6 2043/7 2076/22 2077/1 2078/5 2085/8 2087/4 2089/15 2090/15 2097/8 2098/2 2101/10 governs [1] 2020/20 grab [1] 2089/22 graduate [2] 2042/24 2042/25 graduated [1] 2043/2 graphic [1] 1982/5 great [10] 1992/21 1994/3 2035/15 2045/22 2058/1 2108/12 2119/13 2121/22 2122/3 2122/4 green [3] 1941/10 1994/7 2070/22 Greenberger [1] 2047/24 Greg [8] 1977/23 1977/25 1978/2 1978/5 1978/21 1979/6 2017/16 2033/12 Greg Finning [1] 2033/12 gross [2] 2031/21 2032/24 group [2] 1979/15 2118/2 grows [1] 2089/4 guess [5] 1934/19 2062/8 2064/19 2113/9 2116/10 guidance [1] 2085/5 guide [1] 2010/4 guiding [1] 2087/3 guilt [5] 1953/13 1960/11 2012/10 2018/1 2037/7 guilty [27] 1939/21 1955/1 1955/2 1965/18 1968/8 1987/10 1987/12 1989/12 2011/4 2037/17 2047/6 2054/9 2056/8 2056/9 2056/16 2064/2 2068/7 2068/19 2068/23 2099/12 2099/13 2099/14 2109/20 2113/7 2113/11 2114/23 2116/5 gun [3] 2014/14 2093/25 2094/2 guy [8] 2052/22 2055/22 2060/15 2060/16 2060/17 2060/25 2063/23 2090/16 GX [27] 1941/6 1942/6 1942/19 1942/21 1942/24 1943/17 1944/18 1946/9 1948/11 1948/11 1948/19 1950/10 1950/25 1952/12 1957/10 1961/8 1970/7 1970/14 1971/8 1976/3 1976/3 1978/4 1981/24 1983/21 1984/8 1985/22 1985/22 GX 701-A [1] 1957/10

## Η

H-U [1] 2003/22
Habeeb [3] 1978/18 1979/4 2033/15
half [4] 2019/8 2024/21 2045/14 2104/4
halfway [2] 1938/12 1948/24
hand [3] 2075/18 2111/17 2115/22
handed [2] 1936/19 1980/8
handle [3] 2003/6 2073/22 2115/20
handled [1] 1978/11
hands [4] 1942/13 1965/6 2055/20
2106/24
hands-off [1] 1965/6
hands-on [1] 1942/13
handwriting [2] 2051/6 2051/7
hang [2] 2104/4 2121/16
happenstance [1] 2112/2

happy [1] 2121/29 harass [23] 1940/17 1943/5 1944/23 1945/14 1948/17 1948/22 1949/17 1949/25 1954/8 1954/9 1955/6 1958/10 1958/12 1959/3 1965/22 1986/1 1987/14 1988/18 2037/25 2038/1 2044/5 2109/2 2111/7 harassed [3] 1938/5 1952/18 2038/20 harassing [5] 1938/22 1952/24 1953/22 1955/16 1958/22 harassment [25] 1943/12 1944/25 1945/12 1949/3 1949/4 1955/5 1956/24 1957/13 1958/15 1958/17 1962/25 1963/4 1963/7 1965/25 1966/11 1968/19 1976/13 2039/25 2043/8 2043/9 2043/10 2043/20 2047/12 2116/5 2118/15 hard [2] 1995/8 2014/23 headaches [1] 1959/21 health [3] 1959/10 1959/11 1959/19 heard [98] 1939/17 1940/7 1942/16 1945/10 1946/25 1951/2 1957/16 1959/9 1961/2 1961/22 1962/4 1962/25 1963/1 1963/23 1973/3 1975/22 1975/25 1976/16 1977/7 1977/21 1978/18 1983/23 1985/8 1985/10 1985/20 1985/23 1991/5 1991/23 1991/24 1991/25 1992/8 1992/14 1993/2 1993/6 1994/5 1994/7 1996/16 1996/25 1997/19 1998/16 1998/17 1999/19 2000/3 2001/11 2005/19 2008/10 2008/14 2009/25 2011/22 2014/15 2016/8 2016/22 2018/10 2019/6 2020/19 2020/21 2021/1 2021/2 2021/4 2021/16 2021/17 2021/23 2023/2 2026/4 2026/21 2027/11 2029/7 2029/24 2031/23 2040/21 2042/8 2043/2 2043/21 2043/24 2045/2 2045/24 2048/19 2051/4 2052/3 2060/25 2068/13 2068/17 2068/21 2071/19 2072/3 2075/17 2084/11 2094/1 2099/2 2105/11 2105/14 2105/20 2105/21 2108/20 2109/12 2114/4 2117/13 2118/14 heavily [1] 2117/3 HEEREN [9] 1933/15 1935/9 1991/5 2064/18 2107/14 2107/20 2108/8 2119/2 2123/8 Hello [2] 2067/24 2067/24 helpless [1] 2106/24 hemorrhage [2] 1946/21 1959/20 herself [2] 1963/20 2072/11 Hi [1] 2004/20 hidden [1] 2026/8 hide [10] 2017/23 2019/11 2028/19 2030/1 2030/2 2031/11 2033/3 2033/4 2034/2 2034/3 hiding [8] 2028/5 2028/25 2031/4 2031/5 2032/19 2033/9 2034/18 2035/21 high [1] 2113/16 highlights [2] 1974/18 2087/18 highly [5] 1941/7 1941/15 1971/15 1985/9 2013/2 Hill [4] 2101/9 2101/24 2102/4 2102/13 Hills [9] 1993/21 2014/7 2014/11

2040/23 2044/2 2044/6 2044/7 2044/9

2117/18 himself [17] 1944/4 1945/3 1955/13 1957/1 1958/10 1963/18 1975/24 1976/4 1993/11 2019/6 2021/4 2024/15 2058/12 2077/14 2089/13 2102/18 2116/16 hint [1] 2087/4 hire [5] 1940/20 1972/7 1992/6 2014/2 2116/11 hired [20] 1941/2 1941/22 1969/9 1971/5 1974/10 1974/23 1976/8 1984/17 1988/1 1988/3 1991/22 1992/2 1992/5 1995/24 2008/12 2080/3 2080/13 2110/22 2116/21 2117/5 history [4] 1975/9 1992/20 2060/16 2091/6 hitting [1] 2012/8 hold [11] 1936/20 1939/12 1966/2 1977/17 2043/18 2049/3 2065/12 2078/8 2088/18 2089/2 2098/23 holding [1] 1960/22 home [42] 1938/7 1938/17 1945/2 1945/22 1947/20 1947/24 1948/4 1948/12 1948/17 1949/18 1950/14 1951/1 1951/17 1955/20 1957/2 1958/12 1960/13 1961/25 1962/2 1962/24 1963/3 1969/20 1972/10 1977/1 1985/7 1985/14 1985/24 1985/24 1986/3 1986/5 1986/12 1988/6 1988/24 1993/21 1993/21 2053/2 2056/22 2058/10 2059/5 2115/19 2115/21 2116/16 Homeland [4] 1956/17 1978/7 2074/12 2104/17 homes [1] 2114/13 honest [1] 1934/23 honestly [1] 2046/2 Hong [2] 1971/16 2039/8 Hong Ju Jin [1] 2039/8 Hong Kong [1] 1971/16 Hongru [14] 1945/10 1946/1 1999/19 2005/19 2006/2 2006/16 2007/12 2007/19 2008/23 2009/1 2009/10 2009/25 2068/18 2097/9 Hongru Jin [2] 1945/10 1999/19 Hongzhong [2] 1993/6 1993/7 honor [42] 1935/10 1935/13 1957/10 1983/5 1983/6 1990/7 1990/15 1990/22 2024/8 2032/3 2041/6 2046/12 2046/18 2049/2 2051/9 2054/16 2065/10 2065/21 2066/12 2068/8 2069/18 2075/12 2076/4 2076/9 2078/9 2078/20 2079/13 2080/20 2084/23 2085/1 2086/2 2090/3 2093/8 2093/15 2094/11 2096/16 2099/24 2104/3 2107/16 2108/9 2119/4 2122/2 HONORABLE [1] 1933/9 hope [4] 1937/1 2024/6 2066/25 2099/18 hopefully [3] 1936/5 2011/3 2025/5 hoping [1] 2050/14 horribly [1] 2010/17 hotel [6] 1945/13 1946/4 1983/25 2008/18 2009/20 2084/15 hour [9] 1946/13 1960/12 1983/24 1999/14 1999/15 2000/1 2019/7

I.D [1] 1971/17 iCloud [1] 2074/9 idea [12] 1958/8 2039/19 2039/19 2042/13 2047/8 2060/14 2114/24 2116/11 2116/21 2117/24 2118/20 2118/21 ideas [1] 2067/2 identified [3] 1944/16 1988/6 2013/10 identify [3] 2074/19 2083/3 2089/13 identity [2] 2003/22 2089/18 illegal [11] 1946/16 1953/5 1964/8 1964/10 1964/22 1979/1 1981/21 1981/22 1987/13 2076/3 2109/7 illegally [2] 2012/23 2014/21 images [2] 1938/25 1985/21 imagine [1] 2051/3 immediate [2] 1954/13 2112/11 immediately [5] 1941/20 1975/11 1975/18 2051/7 2055/5 immigration [3] 1992/13 2074/12 2104/17

imply [1] 20 **5**31630 important [20] 1935/4 1997/6 2004/18 2004/23 2008/6 2022/16 2025/15 2051/12 2052/11 2053/22 2053/24 2055/3 2058/13 2062/11 2062/22 2063/1 2063/25 2063/25 2071/5 2116/14 importantly [3] 2067/4 2109/13 2111/5 impossible [1] 2113/20 impressed [1] 2074/7 improperly [5] 1943/21 1956/16 1976/14 1977/22 1978/23 inaccurate [1] 2112/3 inadvertently [1] 2118/22 incident [2] 2041/11 2042/15 include [2] 2120/6 2120/14 included [6] 1938/25 1943/18 1966/11 1976/2 2120/13 2121/8 includes [2] 1949/19 2044/9 including [15] 1938/4 1941/8 1952/22 1955/15 1961/24 1967/13 1967/15 1971/16 1978/3 1981/3 2013/23 2036/1 2073/24 2097/2 2104/19 income [4] 2031/10 2032/23 2032/23 2032/24 inconsistent [2] 1953/17 2000/12 incorporate [1] 2121/24 incorrect [1] 2049/12 incredible [1] 2045/23 incredibly [1] 1969/13 indeed [2] 1994/20 2019/20 indicate [2] 2001/2 2040/16 indicates [3] 2052/25 2083/22 2088/5 indicating [1] 2075/7 indictment [7] 1934/22 1968/10 2037/24 2055/4 2056/17 2063/3 2063/5 indirectly [1] 2043/15 individual [9] 1966/18 1977/13 1977/20 1978/19 1983/9 2066/17 2071/23 2072/9 2112/20 individuals [5] 1973/12 2075/16 2108/22 2120/21 2121/6 inexorably [1] 2012/18 infer [13] 1977/21 1983/15 2005/10 2012/5 2012/9 2012/13 2101/2 2101/13 2101/15 2101/15 2101/25 2111/19 2118/11 inference [9] 2070/3 2079/16 2101/14 2114/1 2114/1 2114/2 2114/2 2116/19 2116/19 info [3] 1976/22 1976/23 2026/7 inform [1] 2002/10 information [97] 1941/7 1941/12 1941/13 1941/14 1941/16 1941/21 1943/11 1943/15 1943/15 1943/16 1943/17 1943/19 1943/21 1943/24 1949/13 1949/16 1955/24 1956/4 1956/7 1956/9 1956/16 1956/18 1956/21 1967/18 1967/20 1969/14 1970/3 1970/4 1970/13 1971/15 1971/17 1971/18 1971/21 1974/23 1975/18 1976/2 1976/6 1976/9 1976/12 1976/13 1976/15 1976/25

1976/25 1977/3 1977/5 1977/10

1977/22 1978/2 1978/8 1978/9

1977/10 1977/12 1977/16 1977/17

1978/10 1978/14 1978/17 1978/19

1978/23 1979/4 1982/8 1982/12 1983/13 1988/14 1988/16 1999/1 1999/1 1999/6 2001/6 2021/23 2030/20 2033/12 2033/17 2033/25 2034/24 2035/22 2035/25 2036/2 2041/9 2042/18 2043/8 2052/6 2059/11 2080/8 2080/14 2080/15 2080/23 2081/5 2081/7 2081/18 2094/25 2095/1 2104/17 2117/1 2117/4 2117/7 2118/24 informed [3] 1942/10 2014/8 2055/14 informs [1] 1998/1 initial [3] 1969/10 2035/24 2088/12 initiate [1] 1967/10 injustice [1] 2046/23 inner [3] 2009/18 2009/19 2010/1 innocence [3] 2012/11 2015/19 2070/6 innocent [4] 2029/20 2036/25 2037/16 2047/15 inquiry [2] 2002/6 2005/3 inside [7] 1950/25 1961/25 1985/16 1985/17 1986/4 1989/2 1989/3 insinuates [1] 2020/12 Inspection [1] 1974/5 instance [1] 2067/3 instead [7] 2001/4 2029/5 2040/3 2072/7 2075/23 2077/9 2107/4 Institute [2] 2022/10 2022/11 instruct [15] 1953/16 1954/15 1964/12 1964/21 1965/1 1965/8 1966/17 1968/4 2000/10 2011/3 2011/23 2019/16 2037/20 2070/2 2119/11 instructed [2] 1983/25 2006/7 instruction [7] 1984/21 2006/6 2016/11 2038/13 2071/4 2113/12 2113/14 instructions [16] 1934/9 1936/1 1953/18 2011/2 2042/9 2054/19 2063/4 2066/15 2066/18 2075/17 2097/21 2102/11 2119/22 2120/4 2120/8 2121/25 instructs [1] 1953/17 insufficiency [1] 2076/13 integral [1] 2088/7 intelligence [1] 2105/18 intend [1] 1934/14 intended [2] 1951/16 2038/22 intent [10] 1940/14 1954/7 1954/9 1955/16 1959/3 2010/25 2027/9 2030/23 2037/25 2038/1 intention [1] 2089/19 intentionally [2] 1954/20 1965/12 interacted [1] 1996/20 interest [1] 2102/4 interesting [3] 2052/2 2052/20 2120/18 intermediaries [2] 1967/14 1967/25 intermediary [1] 1972/7 intermediate [1] 2098/6 international [4] 1956/22 1957/12 1958/15 2100/3 internationally [2] 1955/14 1957/6 Interpol [11] 1975/21 1975/23 1976/1 2021/8 2090/9 2091/1 2091/3 2093/22 2093/24 2095/11 2096/9 interpretation [1] 1937/4 interpreter [25] 1942/8 1942/9 1979/14 2076/19 2076/19 2077/4 2078/2 2080/3 2080/24 2084/9 2086/17 2088/5 2090/13 2094/14 2094/20

interpreter... [10] 2095/2 2095/6 2095/15 2095/18 2095/21 2095/22 2096/1 2096/3 2096/24 2103/2 interrogated [1] 2019/7 interrupt [1] 2007/18 intersection [1] 1996/14 interstate [32] 1953/9 1953/19 1954/2 1954/5 1954/15 1954/18 1955/4 1955/4 1955/9 1959/2 1960/11 1960/14 1961/18 1962/15 1962/17 1963/7 1964/6 1965/17 2024/20 2037/19 2037/21 2037/23 2037/25 2038/9 2038/17 2052/16 2056/8 2056/9 2058/14 2067/12 2068/23 2070/10 interview [6] 1956/12 1957/5 1960/20 1974/6 1983/3 2046/7 interviewed [2] 2084/18 2118/1 intimidate [12] 1940/18 1950/15 1954/8 1954/9 1955/6 1959/3 1965/23 1985/14 1986/1 1987/14 2038/1 2109/2 intimidated [1] 2038/21 intimidating [1] 1953/22 intimidation [7] 1943/13 1949/6 1952/21 1955/5 1956/24 1957/12 1968/19 introduce [4] 2077/15 2077/17 2088/12 2088/14 introduced [7] 2000/14 2000/15 2000/17 2031/13 2082/1 2088/9 2088/24 introducing [1] 2102/18 invaded [3] 1960/16 1985/15 1989/1 invasive [2] 1943/12 1962/18 investigate [2] 1977/19 2036/1 investigating [3] 1995/19 2010/13 2109/4 investigation [11] 1992/3 2000/24 2004/16 2004/16 2017/20 2018/21 2020/9 2026/22 2026/23 2039/17 2046/6 investigations [1] 2023/4 investigative [2] 1979/15 2016/4 investigator [41] 1940/21 1949/1 1957/15 1970/1 1970/3 1970/12 1975/8 1975/10 1975/19 1977/7 1988/1 1988/3 1991/23 1992/3 1992/9 1992/16 1992/18 1992/22 2001/23 2003/13 2007/16 2007/21 2008/25 2009/4 2009/7 2029/2 2035/22 2046/3 2047/11 2072/15 2073/23 2080/13 2080/25 2087/21 2088/4 2088/10 2090/11 2093/19 2093/20 2094/14 2104/19 investigators [8] 1991/25 1992/2 1994/2 1994/18 2014/13 2018/22 2022/13 2032/2 investment [1] 2026/9 invitation [1] 2024/10 invited [2] 2005/23 2009/22 invoice [1] 2001/24 invoices [2] 2016/14 2016/19 involved [24] 1945/17 1953/2 1965/25 1966/10 1974/2 1992/3 1995/24 1997/12 2001/7 2013/13 2013/17 2016/10 2022/18 2022/19 2044/23

2045/15 20**46/5<sup>2</sup>2**060/7 2061/1 2062/12 2062/20 2063/17 2065/5 2116/2 involvement [8] 2059/23 2071/21 2081/4 2082/19 2084/2 2088/14 2089/1 2116/22 involving [3] 1959/5 2073/23 2087/22 iota [1] 2038/20 IRISA [1] 1933/16 irrelevant [2] 1976/7 2106/20 IRS [1] 2050/21 issue [10] 1944/6 1968/20 2007/23 2008/1 2018/25 2032/16 2035/13 2048/23 2095/24 2120/1 issues [2] 1940/13 2119/19 it'll [1] 1935/4 itself [9] 1955/5 1961/14 1977/15 1978/13 1979/20 2050/19 2058/15 2116/3 2116/3

J Lifetime [3] 2002/3 2002/5 2041/1 J-I [1] 2003/22 jail [5] 1947/18 1960/6 2025/12 2027/4 2100/22 jailed [1] 1947/13 Jane [1] 2120/3 Jason [10] 1969/12 1971/10 1975/2 1975/13 1979/11 1993/5 2001/4 2043/15 2110/7 2118/22 Jason Zhu [2] 1993/5 2043/15 jerk [1] 2063/23 Jersey [42] 1938/8 1938/13 1942/17 1943/3 1945/1 1945/8 1946/13 1950/17 1955/12 1956/25 1957/22 1959/16 1960/13 1962/21 1968/19 1976/15 1976/16 1978/3 1991/25 1992/9 1992/15 1992/18 1992/23 1993/21 1993/22 1994/13 2013/4 2014/12 2028/4 2034/9 2034/21 2035/23 2036/17 2038/10 2050/4 2053/2 2053/13 2053/21 2055/19 2055/24 2060/12 2082/4 Ji [55] 1942/14 1942/17 1942/20 1942/25 1943/2 1943/9 1943/14 1944/14 1944/24 1944/25 1945/3 1946/12 1949/10 1955/24 1956/13 1966/12 1967/10 1967/13 1967/18 1969/17 1972/1 1972/3 1972/5 1972/20 1972/21 1972/23 1973/12 1974/11 1979/19 1980/5 1980/11 1980/25 1987/24 2003/22 2003/24 2009/16 2026/14 2082/2 2082/21 2082/23 2083/2 2083/4 2083/8 2084/13 2086/15 2086/21 2087/20 2087/23 2089/11 2089/16 2089/19 2098/17 2110/8 2118/13 2118/14 Jin [143] 1937/24 1938/2 1938/5 1938/9 1938/14 1938/17 1938/19 1938/23 1939/6 1940/22 1941/2 1941/22 1941/23 1942/1 1942/3 1943/5 1944/2 1945/3 1945/7 1945/10 1945/14 1945/24 1945/25 1946/1 1946/2 1946/24 1946/24 1947/15 1947/25 1948/1 1948/4 1948/4 1948/8 1948/14 1948/22 1948/25 1949/8 1949/15 1949/17 1949/25 1950/13 1951/14 1951/16 1952/2 1952/8

1952/10 1952/18 1952/20 1952/24 1953/22 1954/9 1954/12 1955/18 1956/6 1956/8 1957/6 1957/13 1957/19 1958/11 1959/9 1959/11 1960/2 1960/3 1960/16 1960/24 1961/11 1961/23 1962/4 1962/22 1963/1 1965/23 1968/1 1970/2 1971/6 1971/7 1971/9 1971/11 1971/13 1972/8 1972/15 1972/22 1973/15 1973/17 1973/20 1973/24 1974/11 1974/16 1975/12 1975/16 1975/23 1976/2 1976/10 1976/19 1977/22 1979/1 1979/8 1981/13 1981/14 1981/15 1982/3 1982/17 1982/23 1983/18 1984/11 1984/17 1985/6 1985/24 1986/11 1987/3 1987/4 1987/14 1987/24 1988/19 1988/24 1992/4 1995/4 1995/23 1999/19 2001/2 2001/2 2001/6 2005/20 2006/2 2006/16 2007/12 2007/20 2008/23 2009/1 2009/10 2009/25 2026/22 2039/8 2068/18 2068/18 2090/22 2097/7 2097/9 2097/9 2097/16 2097/19 2102/5 2110/22 2117/12 Jin Hongru [1] 2068/18 Jin Xu [2] 2001/2 2001/6 Jin Xu's [1] 2001/2 Jin's [54] 1938/12 1938/14 1938/25 1942/3 1942/6 1944/15 1944/15 1945/1 1945/3 1945/19 1945/22 1946/18 1946/19 1946/23 1947/10 1947/14 1947/19 1947/20 1947/21 1948/3 1948/5 1948/9 1948/12 1949/7 1949/12 1949/13 1949/16 1949/18 1950/19 1951/12 1952/7 1952/15 1955/11 1955/19 1956/5 1956/5 1956/23 1959/5 1959/17 1960/1 1962/20 1963/3 1963/9 1967/16 1969/18 1969/20 1984/3 1984/5 1985/14 1988/5 1988/13 1989/6 1993/20 2002/9 job [15] 1945/4 2030/18 2031/5 2075/8 2075/20 2077/23 2080/13 2080/25 2097/3 2098/13 2099/3 2099/8 2105/4 2106/7 2106/7 John [1] 2120/3 Johnny [59] 1945/9 1945/21 1946/4 1946/6 1946/11 1946/15 1946/17 1948/9 1948/12 1948/17 1949/3 1955/15 1958/9 1958/16 1967/14 1975/5 1976/20 1976/20 1977/11 1980/5 1980/15 1980/18 1999/13 1999/16 1999/24 2001/14 2001/20 2001/20 2002/2 2002/9 2002/11 2002/13 2003/2 2003/9 2005/21 2006/3 2006/6 2008/20 2008/25 2009/4 2009/6 2009/12 2010/6 2010/7 2013/9 2026/5 2026/13 2036/12 2036/13 2043/16 2046/7 2097/7 2097/16 2097/18 2098/7 2100/13 2100/15 2118/17 2118/19 Johnny Ju [2] 2026/5 2026/13 Johnny Zhu [14] 1945/9 1999/13 1999/16 1999/24 2001/14 2001/20 2001/20 2002/2 2002/9 2043/16 2097/7 2097/16 2097/18 2098/7 joined [1] 1954/20

joint [6] 1981/17 2027/14 2028/16

joint... [3] 2028/24 2029/4 2029/6 joke [1] 2094/1 joked [1] 1957/17 joked about [1] 1957/17 Joseph [1] 2026/20 Joseph Yang [1] 2026/20 Ju [5] 2026/5 2026/13 2038/2 2039/8 2040/8 Ju's [1] 2041/2 judge [34] 1933/10 1935/15 1939/23 1953/15 1953/17 1953/18 1954/15 1964/12 1964/21 1965/1 1965/7 1966/16 1968/4 1984/21 1984/24 2000/10 2011/3 2011/23 2012/12 2019/16 2024/10 2037/6 2037/20 2051/17 2051/18 2053/24 2053/25 2054/5 2059/14 2062/7 2062/17 2062/23 2065/25 2070/2 Judge Chen [2] 2037/6 2037/20 Judge Chen's [1] 2024/10 Judge's [3] 2062/25 2063/11 2071/3 jumped [1] 2027/6 Jun [2] 1966/13 1996/15 June [2] 1933/5 2122/7 June 15 [1] 2122/7 jurors [1] 2053/15 jury [41] 1933/10 1934/4 1934/5 1934/10 1935/19 1936/1 1936/4 1936/17 1936/25 1989/16 1989/23 1990/12 1990/17 1990/23 1993/2 1993/12 2023/23 2024/2 2024/4 2049/21 2057/14 2063/5 2063/8 2064/2 2064/10 2067/18 2067/20 2068/3 2068/4 2086/8 2086/9 2092/1 2093/5 2103/19 2106/20 2106/23 2108/14 2109/14 2119/16 2119/22 2120/11 jury's [1] 2091/14 justice [2] 2048/7 2070/5

### K

justly [2] 2044/18 2045/21

keep [7] 1989/19 2004/7 2015/21 2023/19 2064/16 2091/21 2119/9 keeps [1] 2003/9 Kelly [1] 2013/21 Kennedy [1] 2042/25 kept [4] 1936/4 1974/21 1974/23 2116/15 KEVIN [1] 1933/21 key [6] 1936/22 1940/6 1940/9 2109/10 2110/21 2118/13 kid [3] 2061/4 2066/8 2066/10 kill [2] 1938/11 1944/4 killer [6] 2088/17 2088/19 2088/20 2089/4 2089/4 2089/6 killing [1] 2088/18 kills [1] 2089/5 kinds [1] 2051/3 Kings [1] 1992/11 knock [4] 1936/20 2043/23 2067/16 2067/16 knock-knock [1] 2067/16 knocked [2] 2042/3 2057/5 knocking [3] 1936/20 1936/22 2115/20 knowing [4] 1948/25 1956/11 2109/2 2116/7

knowingly [1312339/9 1939/15 1954/20 1964/18 1965/12 2069/2 2069/2 2069/2 2071/8 2071/8 2071/17 2118/7 2118/7 knowledge [6] 1940/13 2029/17 2031/6 2034/7 2038/14 2111/20 known [13] 1973/9 2011/8 2020/13 2022/18 2027/23 2051/7 2073/7 2080/2 2090/16 2096/20 2115/7 2115/12 2118/10 knows [14] 1999/15 2044/18 2051/20 2059/1 2060/4 2060/6 2060/6 2072/14 2086/21 2095/3 2097/3 2100/15 2111/2 2117/23 Kong [1] 1971/16 Kuang [58] 1950/17 1950/23 1951/5 1960/12 1960/16 1961/2 1961/5 1985/10 1986/2 1986/3 1987/5 2042/9 2048/21 2048/24 2048/25 2048/25 2049/18 2049/20 2051/6 2051/12 2053/1 2053/3 2053/3 2053/7 2053/9 2053/9 2053/13 2053/18 2054/14 2055/2 2055/8 2055/10 2055/18 2055/21 2055/24 2056/1 2056/7 2056/7 2057/16 2057/19 2058/8 2058/9 2058/9 2059/9 2060/11 2060/11 2060/12 2064/16 2065/1 2065/2 2068/21 2068/22 2114/4 2114/22 2115/19 2115/20 2115/23 2115/23 Kuang's [2] 2052/18 2111/21

lack [7] 1983/10 1998/6 2019/17 2037/14 2037/14 2039/21 2109/22 acking [1] 2037/15 ladies [51] 1936/25 1937/13 1939/13 1941/14 1952/17 1961/13 1966/4 1967/6 1987/17 1989/16 1990/23 1993/22 1997/2 2010/21 2011/10 2019/14 2023/18 2024/6 2041/8 2047/18 2049/4 2051/11 2054/18 2065/18 2066/15 2066/20 2068/4 2069/24 2073/8 2074/4 2074/22 2075/15 2077/5 2080/12 2080/23 2086/7 2086/23 2088/16 2089/8 2090/19 2091/20 2093/10 2096/18 2097/5 2100/1 2102/22 2104/23 2106/11 2106/23 2108/2 2108/13 lady [5] 1975/1 1975/3 2052/3 2058/18 2082/16 Lan [28] 1945/6 1945/6 1946/4 1946/6 1946/14 1946/25 1947/2 1947/16 1955/15 1966/14 1967/13 1983/17 1983/17 1983/25 1984/12 1996/15 1999/24 2005/21 2006/4 2006/12 2006/16 2006/19 2007/6 2008/18 2009/16 2045/4 2100/8 2105/1 Lan's [1] 1955/19 language [2] 1977/15 2115/16 Languages [1] 2078/4 Laping [1] 2071/24 laptop [1] 1935/21 largely [1] 1940/8

larger [2] 1962/16 1986/1

late [4] 1942/11 1942/18 2060/9 2062/8 Li Minjun [1] 1996/16

lasted [1] 1983/24

lasting [1] 1952/19

latest [2] 1952/9 1995/5 Laugh [1] 1957/24 launches [2] 1976/1 2021/8 laundering [1] 2017/21 law [38] 1938/8 1939/11 1942/7 1943/21 1945/23 1947/2 1947/20 1947/22 1947/24 1949/18 1953/15 1963/3 1963/9 1969/20 1975/8 1989/11 1992/22 2000/10 2012/25 2014/2 2017/13 2017/14 2025/21 2036/1 2036/3 2041/3 2062/7 2062/10 2063/4 2065/25 2066/3 2066/5 2071/4 2071/6 2109/4 2112/9 2119/11 2120/2 law's [2] 1948/1 1993/20 lawn [2] 1951/12 1951/15 LAWRENCE [1] 1933/18 laws [1] 2075/25 lawyer [2] 1992/13 2066/22 lawyer's [2] 1996/5 2013/4 lead [2] 2012/17 2109/18 leading [9] 1942/19 1950/19 1961/11 1972/1 1972/4 2005/17 2114/21 2114/22 2114/23 lean [1] 2064/15 learn [1] 1984/24 learned [9] 1940/15 1975/16 1975/22 1981/14 1981/15 2008/11 2053/5 2065/22 2105/11 learning [2] 1942/1 2069/10 lease [2] 2035/14 2036/13 leased [4] 1977/1 2035/10 2036/7 2036/13 least [13] 1964/19 1968/18 1975/6 1981/8 2014/10 2034/21 2036/22 2040/9 2044/14 2059/20 2068/6 2096/6 2099/18 leave [8] 1945/23 1956/8 1988/24 1998/9 2063/19 2100/10 2100/13 2100/20 leaving [3] 1951/8 2032/8 2038/19 led [1] 2071/24 left [23] 1938/18 1942/25 1947/22 1947/23 1951/12 1951/14 1951/18 1960/18 1962/23 1970/15 1985/18 1986/5 1986/7 1989/4 1994/6 2059/19 2082/14 2083/15 2083/21 2100/12 2100/15 2113/24 2118/5 legal [2] 2045/25 2075/22 legally [1] 2058/24 legitimate [5] 1949/15 1980/8 1988/16 1991/24 2075/22 length [2] 1991/5 2053/13 lengths [1] 1994/3 lengthy [2] 1945/15 1975/8 leniency [1] 2051/19 less [4] 1949/10 2032/11 2038/22 2121/11 letter [1] 2073/1 letters [4] 1963/2 2043/24 2044/1 2044/1 lever [1] 1956/5 Li [12] 1946/22 1966/12 1979/21 1993/6 1993/7 1996/16 1996/16 1996/22 2005/7 2005/8 2005/11 2043/14 Li Feng [2] 1996/16 1996/22 Li Hongzhong [2] 1993/6 1993/7

## liable [3] 2088/21 2089/2 2098/23 liar [2] 2053/18 2053/18 license [4] 1949/19 1976/18 1978/4 1995/6 licensed [2] 1992/9 2073/23 lie [16] 1971/10 1971/11 1975/9 1975/10 2050/4 2050/18 2050/18 2050/20 2050/20 2050/21 2051/22 2103/8 2103/8 2103/9 2103/15 2111/24 lied [24] 1958/20 1975/14 2010/12 2010/13 2010/13 2011/10 2024/15 2046/10 2050/8 2050/10 2050/10 2050/13 2050/16 2050/23 2051/15 2051/21 2064/18 2064/24 2064/25 2111/21 2111/22 2114/17 2114/17 2114/17 lies [3] 2064/17 2064/25 2111/21 life [7] 1962/12 1963/20 1991/14 1993/23 2037/1 2037/3 2064/3 Lifetime [3] 2002/3 2002/5 2041/1 light [1] 2071/14 lightweight [1] 2003/5 likely [4] 2057/2 2081/2 2114/1 2114/2 likewise [2] 2042/17 2045/6 limited [1] 1977/9 Lina [1] 2080/3 Lina Xu [1] 2080/3 line [10] 1969/11 1975/21 1976/4 1991/14 2019/3 2062/22 2100/4 2108/23 2108/23 2108/25 lines [3] 1957/12 2011/18 2050/2 Linguist [1] 2086/16 link [3] 1976/4 2027/25 2043/13 linked [1] 2042/11 links [2] 2043/17 2043/25 Liping [1] 1992/8 Liping Shi [1] 1992/8 list [6] 2002/3 2045/7 2082/20 2100/3 2119/23 2120/10 listed [2] 1971/2 2083/15 listen [13] 1997/6 2062/10 2062/23 2063/1 2063/11 2066/1 2066/22 2110/10 2110/11 2110/16 2110/20 2111/9 2113/11 listened [2] 2005/20 2006/3 listening [4] 2047/16 2064/9 2067/17 2107/11 lists [2] 1934/8 2119/24 literal [1] 2006/21 literally [1] 1947/22 litigation [1] 2111/11 Little Ferry [1] 2039/16 Liu [55] 1937/25 1938/2 1938/6 1938/7 1938/17 1938/23 1938/24 1939/2 1939/6 1943/5 1943/15 1944/4 1945/2 1947/1 1947/9 1947/22 1951/14 1951/16 1952/3 1952/5 1952/5 1952/7 1952/8 1952/18 1952/20 1952/24 1953/23 1954/9 1954/12 1957/2 1957/7 1960/16 1961/22 1961/23 1963/1 1963/2 1963/9 1963/20 1963/23 1965/23 1969/20 1972/9 1977/23 1985/14 1985/24 1986/11 1987/14 1987/25 1988/19 1988/24 2038/2 2041/3 2045/6 2083/20 2117/11

Liu Fang [11**Þ <sup>1</sup>93**7/25 1938/2 1938/6 1938/17 1939/2 1939/6 1943/5 1947/1 1987/14 1987/25 1988/19 Liu Fang's [7] 1938/7 1938/23 1938/24 1943/15 1945/2 1947/9 1988/24 Liu Yan [4] 1947/22 2041/3 2045/6 2083/20 Liu's [2] 1995/4 2101/9 LLC [1] 2041/1 lo [8] 2055/12 2055/12 2055/15 2055/15 2055/16 2099/5 2099/5 2099/10 local [5] 2014/8 2015/8 2015/11 2015/17 2017/18 locate [22] 1940/21 1941/2 1944/23 1946/2 1948/8 1973/11 1977/19 1988/1 2020/11 2071/22 2072/9 2072/12 2072/13 2075/2 2075/6 2075/8 2075/10 2075/21 2080/13 2089/20 2090/23 2110/9 located [4] 1949/15 1972/8 1988/6 2076/21 locating [2] 1977/13 2073/23 locked [2] 1950/22 1962/3 logic [1] 2031/3 LOL [1] 1957/24 long-lasting [1] 1952/19 looked [6] 1975/14 1976/9 2004/23 2015/21 2113/24 2121/2 looks [4] 1940/23 2030/16 2063/20 2108/24 loop [1] 2102/3 lose [2] 2058/17 2064/1 lost [1] 2060/13 loud [3] 1957/24 2063/22 2108/10 lowly [1] 2097/24 luck [1] 2067/17 Lui [2] 1976/3 1976/10 lunch [5] 1990/18 1990/19 2023/12 2024/6 2091/15 Luncheon [1] 2023/25 LUSTBERG [3] 1933/18 2023/6 2023/20 Lusterberg [14] 1935/5 1989/25 1990/6 1990/14 1990/16 1990/18 1990/21 1994/9 2024/7 2046/14 2047/3 2047/17 2107/3 2123/5 lying [2] 2056/11 2056/15 M

Macao [1] 1971/16 mafia [1] 2099/6 mail [31] 1938/24 1938/24 1942/9 1971/8 1971/24 1974/25 1975/12 1975/13 1975/15 1975/20 1979/3 1995/12 1997/23 2000/2 2000/20 2073/2 2073/2 2073/5 2073/9 2073/9 2073/13 2073/13 2074/11 2075/6 2077/6 2100/12 2116/24 2118/9 2118/19 2121/23 2121/24 mailed [1] 1949/11 mailing [3] 2117/17 2117/17 2117/17 mailings [6] 1952/6 1952/9 1952/12 1952/13 1963/2 2114/12 mails [3] 2000/17 2074/24 2116/25 mainland [2] 1951/2 1986/13 major [3] 1976/11 1976/11 2100/18 male [1] 2073/24

man [10] 1943/25 1944/2 1945/21 1948/23 1972/18 1996/11 2047/15 2048/21 2061/4 2117/5 manager [2] 2004/20 2005/11 managing [1] 2041/3 manipulated [1] 2046/10 manipulative [1] 2010/17 manipulativeness [1] 2045/23 mapped [2] 2052/9 2052/21 March [1] 1944/24 March 2017 [1] 1944/24 marching [1] 1985/6 marijuana [3] 2053/6 2053/10 2055/22 mark [1] 2030/23 Martha [1] 2027/15 Martha Burn [1] 2027/15 Mary [1] 2027/15 Mary McMahon [1] 2027/15 massacre [1] 2088/18 match [1] 2074/11 matter [15] 1951/4 1964/3 1981/18 2006/5 2017/17 2031/3 2031/4 2033/20 2034/15 2045/21 2063/24 2073/23 2112/7 2112/9 2122/7 matters [4] 2023/4 2039/18 2066/8 2112/12 Matthew [1] 1966/21 May 13 [1] 2101/18 May 2018 [1] 1972/8 MC [3] 1976/21 2001/20 2003/3 McCarthy [1] 2025/11 McGuire's [1] 1966/21 MCMAHON [291] McMahon's [25] 1941/3 1955/18 1958/9 1962/22 1969/15 1974/20 1975/8 1978/21 1979/7 1982/1 1982/14 1983/11 1984/17 1991/14 1994/4 2017/17 2024/24 2027/9 2029/23 2030/14 2030/17 2030/19 2034/7 2042/20 2110/20 mean [27] 1935/2 1935/16 1940/10 1946/8 1983/20 2006/20 2008/21 2009/17 2028/20 2032/13 2043/20 2048/17 2058/1 2062/10 2062/19 2064/14 2073/18 2075/1 2076/17 2077/19 2084/8 2087/24 2098/4 2101/12 2101/23 2103/15 2104/12 meaning [11] 1947/2 1969/12 1971/6 1975/5 1976/21 1977/16 1978/12 2001/22 2006/21 2048/8 2065/14 means [6] 1951/2 1966/17 1968/15 1984/24 2075/10 2098/22 meant [8] 1944/9 1944/10 1944/10 1957/11 1957/11 1984/8 2016/17 2099/6 meanwhile [1] 2008/13 mechanical [1] 1933/25 media [4] 1985/9 1985/9 2115/24 2115/25 meet [5] 1942/15 1947/7 1956/14 2071/11 2084/13 meeting [35] 1942/16 1942/19 1942/22 1943/3 1945/16 1946/3 1946/14 1948/3 1948/4 1956/15 1969/16 1972/2 1972/3 1972/5 1978/6 1983/16 1983/17 1983/22 1983/24 1983/25 1996/5 1996/12 1996/25 1999/12

1999/12 1999/16 1999/18 1999/23

```
Μ
meeting... [7] 2005/21 2005/22 2006/25
2009/1 2010/1 2026/16 2087/19
meetings [1] 1998/14
MELINDA [1] 1933/20
member [6] 1954/13 1954/22 1965/13
2041/3 2070/14 2118/17
members [5] 1944/5 1959/21 1988/15
1993/11 2118/13
memo [1] 1969/11
memory [1] 2072/19
men [3] 1961/24 2042/2 2082/22
menace [1] 2061/1
mental [3] 1962/5 1962/10 1963/10
mention [4] 2025/12 2035/21 2044/14
2101/6
mentioned [9] 1937/1 1972/25 1984/10
2006/4 2024/25 2052/17 2052/19
2072/4 2115/9
mentioning [2] 2077/22 2079/8
mentions [3] 2020/14 2020/17 2020/18
MEREDITH [1] 1933/16
merit [1] 2113/3
meshes [1] 1948/16
message [16] 1944/2 1950/18 1964/2
1984/4 1985/18 1985/19 1997/25
2015/6 2075/6 2114/4 2114/7 2114/8
2115/6 2115/8 2115/15 2116/3
messages [13] 1938/9 1938/9 1938/22
1950/2 1950/5 1950/7 1950/8 2074/23
2075/6 2093/23 2096/3 2097/14
2112/11
messaging [1] 2083/6
met [20] 1943/10 1945/9 1946/11
1946/12 1946/13 1980/5 1987/23
1996/2 1996/20 2013/2 2038/6 2039/3
2072/4 2082/4 2082/9 2082/22 2083/2
2083/9 2084/1 2095/20
methods [2] 1949/5 1982/6
mic [1] 2107/20
MICHAEL [30] 1933/6 1939/8 1940/20
1941/17 1948/2 1948/21 1966/24
1971/4 1972/3 1972/7 1974/13
1974/14 1975/15 1988/3 1988/11
1988/21 2003/22 2018/8 2019/24
2019/25 2028/21 2042/12 2042/12
2046/3 2084/6 2087/21 2104/20
2110/20 2116/11 2117/2
Michael McMahon [3] 2028/21 2084/6
2087/21
microscopic [1] 2037/4
middle [3] 1942/24 2077/16 2111/11
middleman [19] 1970/11 1970/14
1971/2 1971/3 2077/3 2077/8 2077/14
2077/14 2077/14 2077/16 2077/18
2081/10 2081/11 2081/14 2081/16
2081/24 2087/19 2102/18 2117/19
might [7] 1951/9 1951/10 1959/13
2080/16 2111/5 2119/4 2119/5
Mike [85] 1991/14 1991/20 1992/17
1992/19 1994/17 1995/24 1996/6
1996/12 1996/13 1996/19 1997/4
1997/18 1997/23 1998/3 1998/5
1998/7 1998/12 2000/18 2001/2
2001/13 2003/14 2003/15 2003/23
```

2004/2 2004/3 2004/9 2004/12

2004/20 2004/20 2005/15 2005/22

2006/4 2006/4 2006/5 2006/6 2006/9

```
2007/4 2008/9-2608/12 2008/23
2009/14 2009/18 2010/8 2010/12
2010/21 2011/9 2011/15 2011/16
2012/18 2012/23 2013/14 2013/21
2014/6 2014/19 2015/6 2015/12
2015/13 2015/24 2016/4 2016/11
2016/23 2017/8 2017/16 2017/17
2018/10 2018/21 2019/5 2019/17
2020/6 2020/10 2020/16 2026/15
2036/11 2036/14 2036/24 2037/16
2043/14 2046/5 2046/9 2046/25
2047/8 2080/4 2081/17 2089/24
2090/11
Mike McMahon [9] 1992/17 1998/3
1998/5 2036/24 2043/14 2080/4
2081/17 2089/24 2090/11
Mike's [6] 1997/8 2000/21 2003/11
2015/2 2015/4 2015/18
Mikey's [1] 2029/23
Millburn [1] 2014/11
millions [2] 2102/21 2102/21
mind [10] 1934/25 1989/19 2023/19
2053/17 2056/18 2062/6 2081/10
2091/21 2114/10 2119/9
minds [1] 2060/2
Minjun [2] 1946/22 1996/16
minute [3] 1995/13 2103/10 2104/2
minutes [17] 1972/22 1978/1 1989/25
1998/14 2015/22 2023/7 2025/4
2037/18 2041/13 2082/24 2086/12
2091/17 2091/22 2092/3 2116/9
2118/5 2119/2
Miranda [1] 2084/22
misconduct [1] 2010/20
misguided [2] 2096/12 2106/25
misread [1] 2006/14
missed [1] 1985/19
missing [3] 2027/24 2031/18 2103/12
mission [5] 1959/15 2025/23 2027/2
2027/2 2069/4
missions [1] 2105/19
misspoke [1] 1980/10
misstated [1] 2049/13
mistake [2] 1960/18 2013/1
Mister [1] 1975/2
misunderstanding [3] 1995/10 1995/14
2004/25
misused [1] 1976/14
moment [9] 1940/5 1953/12 1983/14
1998/9 1998/13 2008/8 2011/22
2107/18 2108/3
moments [2] 1971/24 2117/13
Monday [4] 2001/22 2001/25 2003/13
2010/16
money [61] 1971/7 1971/10 1971/12
1975/13 1980/7 1982/11 1982/17
1982/19 1982/20 1994/21 1995/15
1995/20 1995/21 1997/20 2000/20
2001/3 2001/4 2004/21 2005/1
2005/12 2016/16 2017/21 2017/25
2018/10 2020/10 2025/11 2025/24
2027/18 2028/11 2028/19 2028/19
2028/22 2028/23 2029/3 2029/10
2029/22 2030/1 2030/2 2030/5 2030/6
2030/9 2030/10 2031/4 2031/16
2031/17 2031/19 2032/10 2032/12
2032/25 2036/25 2055/20 2060/22
2072/9 2084/8 2084/8 2084/8 2096/10
```

2103/3 2103/9 2103/15 2103/16 monitor [2] 1976/23 2001/21 monitored [1] 2083/16 monitoring [1] 2083/13 monopoly [1] 2070/18 month [4] 1949/24 2050/10 2050/10 2053/10 months [4] 1979/17 1988/4 1993/16 2047/12 Moreover [1] 2041/11 morning [21] 1934/2 1937/22 1937/23 1939/19 1955/20 1989/17 1990/23 1990/24 2003/4 2003/4 2004/21 2011/22 2025/18 2025/19 2027/5 2031/15 2038/11 2039/13 2073/3 2102/25 2103/6 most [21] 1944/16 1976/5 1982/17 1991/2 1996/18 2014/3 2038/25 2053/24 2057/2 2067/4 2077/8 2077/10 2081/2 2081/10 2090/9 2090/16 2095/11 2109/6 2109/13 2114/1 2114/2 mother [5] 1938/25 1952/15 2088/19 2089/3 2089/5 motion [1] 1956/2 motor [5] 1976/15 1977/13 1991/25 2034/10 2036/17 Motor Vehicle Commission [2] 2034/10 2036/17 mouth [1] 2066/1 move [1] 2031/8 moved [1] 1986/6 moving [1] 2119/5 Mr. Chen [4] 2048/19 2048/20 2048/20 2053/6 Mr. Finning [4] 2017/20 2033/16 2033/20 2033/24 Mr. Gallowitz [3] 2008/15 2015/11 2034/20 Mr. Goldberger [12] 1934/24 1935/5 1991/7 2039/13 2041/12 2047/24 2049/9 2065/20 2066/14 2066/19 2067/19 2099/3 Mr. Greenberger [1] 2047/24 Mr. Heeren [4] 1935/9 1991/5 2107/14 2107/20 Mr. Hu [1] 1972/20 Mr. Jason [2] 1971/10 1975/2 Mr. Jason Zhu [1] 2001/4 Mr. Ju [2] 2038/2 2040/8 Mr. Ju's [1] 2041/2 Mr. Kuang [14] 2048/21 2048/24 2048/25 2049/18 2049/20 2051/6 2053/7 2053/9 2053/9 2053/18 2055/2 2055/18 2055/24 2114/22 Mr. Kuang's [1] 2111/21 Mr. Lustberg [2] 2023/6 2023/20 Mr. Lusterberg [13] 1935/5 1989/25 1990/6 1990/14 1990/16 1990/18 1990/21 1994/9 2024/7 2046/14 2047/3 2047/17 2107/3 Mr. McMahon [70] 1991/22 1993/15 1995/19 1998/15 1998/19 1998/24 1999/9 1999/10 1999/13 1999/17 1999/25 2000/22 2000/23 2001/8 2001/20 2002/5 2005/7 2005/8 2008/15 2009/11 2016/2 2019/21 2022/18 2024/12 2024/13 2025/9

### Μ

Mr. McMahon... [44] 2025/13 2025/16 2025/18 2026/6 2026/9 2026/25 2027/13 2028/8 2029/10 2029/21 2030/24 2031/10 2031/24 2033/11 2033/17 2034/14 2034/17 2035/7 2035/21 2038/7 2038/9 2038/16 2038/20 2039/1 2039/4 2039/15 2039/22 2040/1 2040/6 2040/11 2040/15 2042/7 2042/17 2043/7 2043/22 2043/25 2044/22 2044/24 2045/14 2047/20 2102/19 2111/2 2111/6 2116/22 Mr. McMahon's [8] 1994/4 2024/24 2027/9 2029/23 2030/14 2030/17 2034/7 2042/20 Mr. Tung [18] 1934/24 1935/5 1991/7 2067/23 2068/11 2075/14 2076/6 2076/11 2078/13 2078/16 2080/10 2091/12 2093/3 2093/6 2104/1 2106/19 2107/13 2116/12 Mr. Tung's [2] 2022/2 2091/23 Mr. Xu [5] 2001/4 2044/2 2044/5 2044/16 2045/12 Mr. Xu's [1] 2045/1 Mr. Yan [1] 1995/13 Mr. Yong [6] 2070/21 2073/14 2074/25 2076/18 2077/13 2079/9 Mr. Yong Zhu [16] 2081/6 2081/17 2091/9 2095/7 2095/10 2095/16 2096/7 2096/25 2098/10 2100/4 2100/5 2101/21 2102/11 2102/15 2106/6 2106/24 Mr. Yong Zhu's [1] 2086/17 Mr. Zheng [5] 2112/21 2112/22 2112/24 2113/8 2115/4 Mr. Zhu [12] 1942/10 1992/3 1997/13 2001/5 2001/6 2013/24 2020/9 2059/23 2060/15 2094/25 2116/15 2117/19 Mr. Zhu's [3] 1994/20 2005/3 2042/19 Ms. Arfa [20] 1935/11 1937/10 1937/12 1937/21 1989/15 1997/14 1998/13 1999/14 1999/21 2000/11 2000/25 2007/2 2008/21 2010/15 2024/23 2028/10 2031/9 2031/13 2044/15 2045/11 Ms. Arfa's [1] 2027/20 Ms. Canti [2] 2025/4 2030/7 Ms. Conti [3] 1995/1 1999/5 2006/1 Ms. Gonzalez [4] 1934/11 1935/23 1936/11 1936/19 Ms. Liu [1] 2038/2 Ms. O'Connor [2] 2035/4 2036/8 Ms. Shi [2] 1992/8 1992/10 Ms. Wheeler [1] 1999/3 Ms. Yong Zhu [3] 2081/1 2081/6 2085/3 Ms. Yong Zhu's [1] 2081/4 multiday [1] 1948/13 multiple [1] 2063/2 multiyear [1] 1940/17 must [14] 1947/4 1947/7 1954/25 1957/15 1968/7 1977/17 1999/21 2011/6 2027/23 2063/5 2071/11 2090/17 2090/18 2113/17 mute [1] 2047/23 mutual [1] 1964/24

MVC [5] 20342352035/4 2035/5 2035/11 2035/23

nail [2] 2077/24 2094/15 naive [1] 2106/1 name [23] 1957/10 1980/25 1983/5 2003/19 2004/6 2028/19 2028/20 2028/21 2030/3 2048/19 2048/24 2070/1 2070/13 2073/4 2073/24 2077/3 2077/7 2080/8 2080/15 2090/10 2097/9 2097/16 2107/9 named [5] 2004/6 2026/20 2042/10 2043/14 2052/3 names [10] 1996/16 2077/9 2077/9 2120/5 2120/12 2120/13 2120/23 2121/7 2121/8 2121/8 natural [1] 2062/14 naturally [1] 2087/6 nature [1] 2007/9 near [2] 1996/24 1996/24 nearly [1] 1946/13 necessary [1] 2043/20 need [28] 1934/10 1937/17 1946/8 1955/3 1964/22 1965/18 1968/8 1976/22 1978/15 1983/20 1984/7 1995/16 2005/1 2007/3 2008/21 2012/4 2015/8 2023/10 2044/6 2062/9 2062/9 2062/24 2104/5 2107/17 2107/18 2107/20 2118/24 2122/5 needed [2] 1949/12 1976/12 needn't [1] 2049/7 needs [5] 2001/5 2061/1 2061/2 2067/21 2119/18 negative [1] 2070/3 negligence [1] 2010/24 neighbor [1] 1951/10 nervous [1] 1961/6 never [36] 1982/17 1984/6 1991/21 1991/22 1994/2 1994/15 1995/22 1996/12 1996/13 1996/19 1996/20 1996/20 1996/20 1996/24 2003/23 2003/24 2009/3 2020/15 2021/1 2021/4 2021/17 2025/13 2025/21 2034/13 2038/9 2040/2 2044/24 2050/22 2070/5 2072/4 2088/6 2094/7 2100/16 2105/2 2106/15 2106/16 Neviene [2] 1978/18 2033/15 Neviene Habeeb [1] 2033/15 New Jersey [1] 1978/3 New Jersey MVC [2] 2034/21 2035/23 New York [3] 2033/13 2033/13 2062/21 Newark [2] 1996/24 2045/4 newspaper [1] 1941/21 next [25] 1946/10 1949/7 1970/19 1980/3 1986/16 2009/2 2022/21 2026/19 2031/8 2036/2 2058/11 2058/11 2066/9 2067/13 2067/21 2079/21 2082/12 2082/13 2082/23 2083/3 2083/11 2091/22 2093/24 2113/6 2117/17 nice [2] 2003/24 2052/3 night [7] 1945/16 2001/21 2012/17

2059/13 2060/9 2119/13 2122/4

nobody [8] 2000/4 2051/5 2087/3

none [11] 1966/22 1968/13 2018/4

2039/3 2042/11 2043/13 2059/22

2087/3 2096/22 2097/3 2097/3 2101/1

2059/24 2075/4 2075/4 2077/21 nonexistence [1] 2012/14 noon [1] 1989/18 normal [5] 1990/17 1992/23 2074/21 2080/14 2080/17 not-guilty [1] 2047/6 note [50] 1938/19 1938/19 1940/1 1951/1 1951/13 1951/14 1951/17 1951/19 1960/17 1960/23 1960/23 1961/13 1961/15 1961/16 1961/17 1962/7 1962/10 1962/23 1979/11 1986/6 1986/7 1986/10 1986/12 1995/12 2016/8 2016/22 2029/7 2045/12 2056/21 2057/13 2058/4 2058/5 2058/19 2058/23 2059/3 2059/4 2059/19 2060/4 2063/19 2066/9 2067/13 2077/5 2111/16 2111/23 2111/24 2113/22 2113/23 2114/8 2114/18 2115/14 notes [47] 1936/4 1950/22 1951/6 1951/8 1951/9 1951/12 1951/15 1960/17 1985/18 1988/25 1989/4 1989/5 1993/17 2021/7 2042/4 2049/22 2049/22 2050/1 2050/6 2050/8 2050/13 2050/25 2051/2 2051/8 2053/19 2056/1 2056/3 2056/22 2056/24 2057/2 2057/3 2057/12 2057/21 2057/21 2057/22 2057/23 2057/25 2058/2 2059/3 2059/4 2059/21 2060/12 2065/5 2065/5 2065/6 2065/7 2065/8 nothing [21] 1985/3 2025/10 2029/1 2043/16 2043/25 2044/25 2055/21 2060/19 2060/22 2066/9 2066/10 2073/25 2080/16 2085/19 2085/25 2096/1 2101/25 2102/24 2102/24 2106/9 2111/23 notice [4] 2003/6 2072/10 2077/21 2078/3 noticed [2] 2083/14 2100/8 notification [2] 1966/16 1987/11 notifications [2] 2068/20 2070/9 notified [3] 1968/13 2100/12 2100/13 notify [2] 1964/16 2100/19 notifying [1] 1965/10 November [3] 1943/7 1975/3 2087/25 November 13 [1] 1975/3 November 2016 [1] 1943/7 number [17] 1938/3 1940/4 1941/9 1945/17 1978/3 1995/5 2015/13 2015/14 2018/17 2048/19 2069/15 2078/16 2080/9 2083/15 2085/10 2094/17 2108/6 numbers [7] 1941/10 1971/17 2015/1 2026/11 2045/7 2045/8 2118/10 numerous [2] 1952/6 2026/3 NYC [2] 1992/17 2013/20 NYPD [2] 1940/21 2111/2

NYRCR [1] 1933/22

o'clock [3] 2027/5 2053/1 2057/18 O'Connor [2] 2035/4 2036/8 oath [1] 2037/2 object [1] 1966/1 objection [24] 1967/2 2032/3 2041/6 2046/12 2046/18 2049/2 2051/9 2054/16 2065/10 2065/17 2066/12

```
O
objection... [13] 2068/8 2075/12 2076/4
2079/13 2084/20 2084/20 2084/23
2084/24 2086/3 2086/4 2096/16
2120/22 2121/1
objective [2] 2110/18 2112/13
obligation [1] 2018/7
observe [2] 1961/3 1961/6
obtain [5] 1943/14 1967/11 1988/13
1988/16 2013/22
obtained [10] 1950/14 1956/16
1969/18 1976/15 1977/4 1977/10
1977/22 1978/23 1988/13 1994/19
obtaining [3] 2026/18 2033/12 2033/17
obvious [6] 1943/4 1959/2 1985/2
1987/6 2108/24 2116/4
obviously [15] 1943/12 1946/16
1971/11 1971/21 1989/25 2010/7
2023/14 2039/16 2047/20 2049/7
2068/15 2091/14 2095/22 2101/1
2108/4
occasions [1] 2013/4
occurred [6] 1945/17 1968/19 1968/20
1998/18 1999/22 2025/20
occurring [1] 2087/24
occurs [2] 2041/11 2043/23
October [38] 1941/17 1942/2 1942/11
1942/13 1942/18 1955/21 1956/3
1956/8 1956/13 1967/12 1972/2
1975/1 1977/25 1979/9 1979/16
1993/16 1993/17 2019/5 2022/8
2081/20 2081/20 2082/21 2082/23
2083/1 2083/4 2084/1 2084/3 2084/3
2087/21 2087/25 2090/14 2091/10
2093/21 2094/6 2096/6 2097/3
2104/23 2105/13
October 2016 [6] 1941/17 1956/3
1972/2 2087/25 2097/3 2104/23
October 24 [1] 2022/8
October 26 [1] 2082/21
October 27 [7] 1942/13 2081/20
2082/23 2083/1 2084/1 2084/3
2087/21
October 28 [1] 2083/4
October 5 [3] 2081/20 2090/14 2091/10
October 5th [7] 1975/1 1979/9 1979/16
2084/3 2093/21 2094/6 2096/6
October 6th [2] 1956/8 1993/17
odd [1] 2106/7
offense [6] 2011/4 2011/4 2011/11
2020/24 2113/1 2113/5
offenses [4] 1993/12 2112/23 2112/23
2115/2
office [12] 1947/16 1973/1 1973/2
1973/8 1973/19 1996/5 2001/25
2013/5 2021/3 2026/11 2033/14
2072/2
officer [12] 1940/21 1942/14 1943/1
1943/9 1949/11 1966/12 1969/17
1972/1 1972/20 1979/20 2046/4
2111/2
official [25] 1940/25 1943/23 1964/15
1966/11 1966/19 1966/20 1970/6
1978/13 1978/16 1978/24 1987/23
2003/21 2005/9 2011/7 2071/9 2072/6
2073/5 2073/8 2073/11 2073/15
2074/3 2075/1 2082/3 2089/13
2120/15
```

```
officials [27] <mark>5</mark>1942911 1944/22 1945/11
1947/23 1955/23 1956/18 1957/18
1962/19 1965/24 1966/10 1966/23
1971/23 1972/16 1981/4 1995/24
2008/7 2009/17 2013/2 2074/17
2074/18 2104/16 2104/22 2105/1
2105/2 2110/17 2118/8 2118/23
offshore [5] 1995/11 1995/14 2004/15
2026/18 2026/21
often [1] 1935/17
old [4] 1946/20 2040/3 2069/10
2069/12
older [1] 1963/12
one's [1] 2016/21
ongoing [1] 1943/5
open [11] 1934/1 1934/25 1938/18
1950/21 1985/16 1989/19 2023/19
2024/2 2053/17 2091/21 2119/9
opened [1] 2044/11
opening [5] 1937/10 1955/13 2012/2
2040/6 2088/11
openings [1] 1997/22
operate [2] 1966/19 2023/4
operation [22] 1973/9 1973/10 1974/3
1974/8 1985/7 1985/8 1995/25 1997/1
2008/8 2009/19 2020/14 2020/17
2020/17 2020/18 2021/12 2021/15
2021/16 2021/17 2021/20 2088/8
2111/4 2115/23
opportunity [3] 1966/6 1967/4 2039/2
opposed [5] 2012/25 2029/12 2032/23
2034/19 2076/7
opposite [1] 2016/20
options [2] 1938/10 1944/3
order [19] 1934/14 1934/22 1934/22
1935/1 1938/8 1940/18 1943/5 1945/3
1946/2 1956/14 1987/14 2029/21
2031/25 2035/9 2036/6 2037/21
2040/20 2047/13 2090/22
ordered [1] 2006/23
orders [2] 1957/18 1985/6
ordinary [1] 2106/1
organization [1] 2073/12
origin [2] 2070/23 2070/24
Otherwise [2] 2081/13 2121/25
outline [1] 2038/5
outlined [1] 1974/7
outset [5] 1979/9 1994/20 2011/10
2075/1 2084/4
outside [6] 1948/17 1949/1 1956/25
1958/12 2012/6 2111/8
overall [3] 1948/13 2110/3 2110/18
overarching [2] 1953/1 1965/22
overnight [1] 1963/21
overrule [1] 2065/16
Overruled [13] 1966/3 1967/4 2032/4
2041/7 2046/19 2049/4 2051/10
2065/11 2068/9 2068/9 2068/9
2079/14 2096/17
overseas [8] 1972/25 1972/25 1973/2
1973/6 1973/7 1973/18 1974/3
2110/13
oversight [1] 1982/19
overt [9] 1958/1 1958/4 1965/14
2039/13 2119/23 2120/9 2120/16
2120/17 2120/24
overwhelming [1] 1974/16
owe [3] 1971/12 2103/9 2103/15
```

owed [8] 1971/7 1971/9 1971/10 1975/13 2001/3 2071/23 2072/9 2103/3 owes [1] 2103/16 own [20] 1938/15 1944/8 1944/11 1947/1 1972/17 1975/15 1983/2 1984/18 1993/21 2008/11 2008/13 2020/20 2028/2 2028/23 2029/1 2035/14 2059/9 2062/4 2110/6 2117/25 owned [9] 1977/1 1977/1 2001/3 2001/4 2035/9 2036/7 2036/12 2040/24 2040/25

### Р

package [3] 1984/5 2000/2 2000/4 packages [1] 2114/6 Page 3 [1] 1995/7 pages [11] 1944/11 1944/19 1947/9 1950/10 1963/22 2005/24 2015/3 2021/6 2025/7 2083/17 2103/21 paid [33] 1939/22 1941/4 1946/17 1967/23 1969/12 1993/2 2027/19 2027/20 2027/21 2027/23 2028/2 2028/3 2028/14 2028/15 2030/17 2030/17 2031/23 2032/1 2032/5 2032/8 2032/22 2053/9 2064/5 2081/25 2081/25 2084/8 2084/8 2084/9 2098/9 2102/18 2102/21 2109/11 2115/24 pain [1] 1963/10 pains [1] 2104/14 painstaking [1] 2104/14 PAMELA [1] 1933/9 Panera [24] 1942/16 1942/20 1942/22 1943/10 1946/13 1969/16 1972/2 1980/5 1980/6 1980/9 1983/22 1996/4 1996/4 1996/6 1996/11 1999/12 1999/14 2009/2 2013/3 2013/7 2028/3 2037/8 2082/4 2082/22 Panera Bread [4] 2028/3 2037/8 2082/4 2082/22 paragraph [1] 2034/25 Paramus [2] 2013/4 2028/4 parents [2] 1950/2 1956/8 park [2] 1948/17 1958/12 part [27] 1957/4 1962/16 1964/19 1968/18 1972/23 1972/24 1973/1 1976/13 1985/25 2005/3 2009/18 2009/21 2010/1 2016/9 2018/15 2018/19 2037/15 2052/4 2052/20 2055/16 2057/11 2062/25 2081/4 2088/7 2113/9 2116/15 2117/10 participant [2] 1977/16 2035/1 participants [1] 1945/17 participate [2] 2108/22 2116/20 participated [6] 1939/9 1952/25 1963/7 2110/4 2112/6 2118/15 particular [6] 1940/3 1949/3 2027/14 2034/25 2035/7 2085/15 particularly [2] 1984/22 1994/19 parties [6] 1937/2 1968/14 1968/15 2049/7 2105/10 2121/4 party [12] 1937/16 1962/9 1973/4 2027/1 2070/15 2070/18 2070/18 2070/21 2077/17 2077/17 2081/12 2081/13 party-state [1] 1973/4

```
Р
pass [3] 2081/18 2095/1 2117/6
passage [1] 2024/24
passed [10] 1942/8 1944/2 1956/18
1970/4 1977/4 1978/20 1978/23
1979/13 2112/11 2117/1
passes [1] 2055/20
passing [4] 1979/4 2034/24 2081/8
2116/24
password [3] 1936/2 1936/8 1936/15
past [5] 1940/7 1940/15 2069/9 2108/3
2109/25
patio [1] 1950/24
patron [1] 2089/20
pattern [1] 2029/19
PAUL [5] 1933/19 1992/13 1992/17
2098/24 2099/2
pause [2] 1977/3 2079/2
pawn [1] 2105/19
pay [10] 1980/22 2018/12 2018/13
2025/10 2025/24 2030/14 2071/3
2084/7 2089/8 2096/10
paying [3] 2018/21 2029/10 2084/9
payment [13] 1964/24 1969/10 1980/2
1980/3 1980/4 1980/11 1980/14
1980/17 1980/24 1981/5 1981/13
2027/16 2030/21
payments [12] 1979/2 1979/7 1981/2
1981/7 1981/16 1981/20 1981/22
1981/23 2018/16 2028/6 2028/8
2028/13
PD [1] 2015/11
PEACE [1] 1933/13
peer [1] 1989/3
peered [3] 1950/25 1961/25 1985/17
people's [7] 2011/18 2012/20 2012/24
2019/18 2020/1 2035/5 2045/18
peoples [1] 2086/12
percent [3] 1982/21 2021/22 2062/18
perception [1] 2020/20
perfectly [3] 2010/14 2026/4 2036/25
performed [1] 1993/15
performing [1] 1946/1
perhaps [3] 1948/25 1949/2 2076/13
period [10] 1956/4 1968/6 1968/9
1985/10 2025/22 2032/25 2038/10
2081/21 2081/21 2083/14
Permit [1] 1971/16
permitted [2] 1949/7 2009/13
person [42] 1938/4 1951/7 1952/22
1960/23 1972/19 1973/23 1973/24
1980/8 1999/18 2001/22 2003/5
2007/24 2008/1 2029/1 2030/4
2046/25 2055/13 2055/15 2055/16
2072/9 2073/4 2073/14 2074/7 2075/7
2075/8 2075/21 2077/4 2078/2 2080/8
2089/20 2090/23 2090/25 2090/25
2091/5 2098/7 2098/7 2099/4 2107/5
2110/8 2110/19 2113/19 2116/24
person's [2] 2037/3 2080/14
personal [6] 1943/24 1967/19 1988/14
2029/12 2117/1 2117/3
personally [1] 2111/6
personnel [1] 1978/15
perspective [1] 2033/7
persuade [3] 1946/24 1947/5 1947/8
pertaining [1] 2071/4
phase [1] 1944/25
```

```
phenomenor 143 1991/3
phone [28] 1933/22 1949/20 1954/23
1978/1 2015/1 2015/2 2015/4 2016/24
2016/24 2017/4 2017/9 2045/7 2045/8
2049/19 2052/19 2052/23 2053/1
2054/24 2054/25 2055/1 2057/17
2057/18 2057/20 2080/8 2082/17
2083/17 2087/22 2088/1
phones [7] 1970/14 2052/9 2052/10
2052/14 2052/17 2052/21 2052/22
photo [9] 1942/23 1942/24 1943/3
1948/11 1949/19 1961/9 1970/15
1970/15 1976/17
photos [13] 1942/7 1942/8 1949/18
1949/20 1949/21 1961/8 1972/9
1972/10 1972/11 1972/12 1976/2
1983/24 2073/25
phrase [1] 2112/16
physical [2] 1962/6 1962/11
physically [2] 2045/12 2079/12
pick [1] 2084/12
picked [1] 2064/3
picks [2] 2060/11 2064/11
picture [10] 1996/6 1996/7 1996/9
2037/7 2074/16 2082/6 2082/6 2082/8
2101/6 2101/24
pictures [12] 1958/5 2003/25 2013/7
2039/14 2074/17 2101/10 2102/13
2102/15 2102/20 2104/15 2116/17
2117/15
piece [7] 1997/22 2020/2 2020/5
2021/23 2033/19 2053/16 2117/20
pizza [1] 2030/15
PKC [1] 1933/2
place [19] 1946/12 1954/8 1980/7
1980/8 1996/11 1996/13 1998/19
2013/1 2013/10 2028/4 2037/25
2040/7 2042/7 2042/15 2051/13
2060/14 2060/23 2104/24 2105/4
places [6] 2013/3 2014/19 2026/3
2028/11 2048/10 2062/21
plan [9] 1943/5 1945/14 1945/16
1945/19 1946/11 1948/2 1955/19
2088/7 2110/9
plane [1] 2009/13
planned [3] 1946/19 1947/21 2009/19
plans [1] 1956/9
plate [6] 1949/20 1976/18 1976/22
1978/4 2015/13 2015/14
plates [3] 2034/14 2034/17 2035/9
play [6] 2057/22 2067/15 2069/11
2069/23 2085/22 2085/23
played [5] 1952/23 1953/1 2010/16
2085/20 2085/21
player [1] 2100/18
playing [1] 2097/22
Plaza [1] 1933/14
plead [6] 1991/13 1991/15 2056/8
2056/9 2056/16 2099/14
pleaded [4] 2068/7 2068/19 2068/23
2099/12
PLO [1] 2093/23
plus [1] 2075/23
pocket [1] 2058/3
point [43] 1937/17 1961/3 1976/5
2007/3 2012/22 2017/14 2017/22
2019/1 2027/10 2030/5 2030/15
2030/16 2030/19 2031/8 2036/4
```

2041/2 2051/20 2052/23 2052/24 2056/14 2057/9 2067/10 2069/16 2073/2 2073/19 2075/5 2081/14 2082/5 2083/5 2084/21 2085/7 2086/12 2087/2 2095/14 2095/14 2097/2 2098/5 2112/21 2115/3 2117/8 2117/21 2119/21 2120/21 point-three [1] 2083/5 pointed [7] 2024/22 2024/23 2028/10 2039/12 2079/6 2104/11 2112/22 pointing [3] 2024/17 2097/19 2109/5 points [4] 2018/5 2047/9 2104/7 2109/10 police [23] 1942/14 1942/25 1943/9 1949/11 1957/23 1969/17 1972/1 1972/20 1972/24 1973/15 1979/20 2014/4 2014/8 2014/10 2014/18 2014/20 2015/1 2015/4 2015/8 2015/17 2017/18 2046/4 2113/20 policeman [2] 1966/12 1987/24 policy [1] 1978/12 political [3] 1941/1 1966/13 1970/5 politics [1] 2062/22 poor [2] 1959/10 1959/11 pop [1] 1935/3 pops [1] 2090/25 portion [2] 1937/17 1945/15 posed [1] 2085/4 position [4] 1991/13 2087/8 2090/15 2101/10 possessed [2] 1941/7 1941/12 possesses [1] 1935/24 possibilities [2] 2101/17 2102/22 possible [2] 2050/17 2056/12 possibly [6] 1958/8 2026/10 2039/15 2115/7 2117/9 2118/10 post [11] 1951/8 1956/12 1957/5 1960/19 1974/6 1983/3 1983/11 2043/11 2084/17 2085/8 2114/18 post-arrest [7] 1956/12 1957/5 1960/19 1974/6 1983/3 1983/11 2084/17 postarrest [2] 2110/11 2111/22 posted [4] 1960/17 1986/7 2111/18 2113/22 poster [1] 2020/14 posts [1] 2043/11 potentially [1] 1983/8 pounded [3] 1938/18 1950/20 1961/24 pounding [2] 1951/18 2057/6 powerful [1] 2019/20 powerfully [1] 2014/3 practice [1] 2072/12 PRC [1] 2120/15 premises [2] 2101/12 2101/18 prepare [1] 2072/17 prepared [2] 2052/8 2103/5 present [15] 1999/16 1999/18 2005/23 2009/1 2009/25 2017/19 2018/4 2024/2 2051/18 2053/2 2076/16 2087/17 2088/9 2098/21 2102/23 presented [5] 2071/14 2089/9 2091/8 2098/11 2099/17 presenting [2] 1999/1 2071/7 presents [2] 2087/18 2103/17 President [1] 2062/20 press [1] 2022/2 pressure [3] 1944/13 2056/5 2114/11 pressuring [1] 1983/8

Р presumably [1] 1935/24 presume [1] 2090/1 presumption [1] 1934/19 pretended [1] 1958/21 pretty [4] 1941/9 2037/14 2053/9 2058/16 prevent [1] 2046/23 previous [1] 2094/24 previously [7] 1943/10 1944/17 1946/12 1947/12 1959/20 2109/3 2116/2 pricing [1] 2026/18 primacy [1] 1991/3 primarily [1] 1955/10 primary [1] 2115/4 principles [2] 2062/12 2062/13 print [1] 1995/8 prison [9] 1938/20 1951/3 1968/2 1986/14 1987/4 1987/5 1989/7 2111/18 2115/15 prisons [1] 1987/6 private [52] 1940/21 1957/15 1970/1 1970/3 1970/12 1975/8 1975/19 1977/6 1985/15 1987/4 1988/1 1988/2 1991/23 1991/24 1992/1 1992/2 1992/9 1992/18 1994/1 1994/17 2006/22 2007/16 2007/21 2008/5 2008/25 2009/4 2009/7 2022/13 2035/22 2046/3 2047/11 2071/23 2072/15 2073/23 2076/20 2080/12 2080/24 2086/18 2087/20 2088/4 2088/10 2089/22 2090/11 2093/19 2094/14 2095/18 2097/1 2097/2 2104/19 2106/17 2117/22 2117/25 privately [1] 2116/1 privilege [1] 2096/14 probable [1] 2060/7 problem [4] 1936/6 1936/8 2023/11 2121/13 problems [3] 1936/3 1951/10 2048/15 proceed [1] 2067/21 proceedings [2] 1933/25 2079/2 proceeds [1] 1997/10 process [4] 1935/20 1991/2 2104/12 2104/15 produce [1] 2098/20 produced [3] 1933/25 2042/11 2082/15 profession [1] 1991/24 Professional [1] 2104/19 professor [14] 1973/3 1973/5 1973/10 1974/1 1983/5 2020/22 2021/24 2021/25 2022/1 2070/12 2070/19 2105/6 2105/12 2105/15 proffer [1] 2050/11 profile [1] 1970/15 profit [5] 2031/21 2031/21 2031/21 2031/25 2031/25 program [5] 2022/14 2035/1 2035/6 2035/23 2088/8 programs [1] 2020/25 progressing [1] 1948/15 prohibited [2] 1977/18 2035/1 projector [1] 2069/13 promised [1] 2075/2 proof [16] 1937/9 1953/24 1983/1 2033/22 2033/24 2038/8 2038/20 2054/3 2054/10 2054/22 2054/22

2060/18 2062/18 2062/17 2071/16 2103/11 proofs [2] 2024/16 2034/6 proper [1] 1963/10 properly [1] 1993/10 property [11] 1960/16 1985/15 1989/1 2002/3 2004/16 2026/7 2026/21 2057/25 2058/4 2058/12 2102/13 proposal [2] 2039/10 2120/6 propose [1] 2120/1 proposed [3] 1957/25 2039/22 2111/7 proposes [1] 1958/10 proprietary [1] 2121/14 prosecute [8] 1984/12 2025/2 2027/5 2045/20 2110/23 2110/25 2111/1 2111/3 prosecuted [3] 2061/2 2101/3 2107/5 prosecution [1] 2029/19 prosecutor [10] 1945/7 1946/4 1946/25 1966/13 1966/14 1979/21 1983/18 2050/18 2064/19 2064/21 prosecutor's [1] 1947/16 prosecutors [4] 2011/13 2049/25 2050/8 2050/12 protect [6] 1936/8 1938/10 1944/3 2045/17 2047/1 2047/20 protections [2] 1936/3 2100/2 prove [18] 1987/19 1998/10 2037/22 2070/6 2071/11 2074/15 2089/15 2091/7 2091/8 2095/20 2095/25 2096/4 2098/20 2101/18 2102/23 2103/18 2104/15 2104/21 proved [3] 1940/10 1961/19 2096/5 proven [12] 1939/17 1959/8 1960/9 1960/14 1962/13 1964/5 1968/11 1974/12 1984/19 1987/8 1987/15 1994/3 proves [3] 1953/13 1955/8 1968/5 provide [8] 1935/21 1966/6 1966/16 1984/21 1992/1 2018/18 2042/14 2078/13 provided [19] 1941/17 1942/10 1943/16 1943/18 1956/7 1956/15 1967/19 1969/13 1971/14 1978/8 1978/10 2018/15 2040/6 2040/13 2042/18 2080/24 2084/13 2084/14 2119/24 provides [2] 1956/9 2081/5 providing [1] 2084/16 pseudonyms [1] 2120/15 Psychologists [1] 1991/2 public [9] 1970/5 1978/14 1980/7 1996/11 2013/2 2028/4 2040/24 2041/9 2085/19 publicized [1] 1985/9 publicly [1] 2099/23 publish [2] 2086/1 2094/12 pull [3] 2006/25 2025/4 2030/7 pulled [2] 1978/19 1993/24 punishment [1] 2044/17 purchases [1] 1995/5 purely [1] 2118/25 purpose [16] 1948/13 1948/14 1949/16 1958/15 1959/6 1959/7 1977/11 1988/17 2026/1 2035/24 2036/15 2049/12 2073/17 2076/1 2089/20 2112/15 purposefully [1] 1984/25

pursuant [2] 2035/22 2072/1
put [34] 1935/25 1956/2 1987/5
2005/25 2006/1 2009/10 2012/15
2014/16 2016/16 2019/3 2027/4
2028/19 2028/22 2028/23 2029/4
2030/6 2030/12 2031/20 2033/22
2037/20 2042/3 2049/23 2056/21
2057/3 2057/4 2058/2 2058/19 2061/2
2065/8 2076/23 2078/18 2089/25
2118/8 2120/23
puts [2] 2036/24 2042/21
putting [5] 1983/9 1983/10 1997/20
2030/3 2033/8

### Q

Qin [1] 1947/15 qq.com [3] 2073/5 2073/9 2118/8 questioned [5] 1984/6 1999/5 2021/5 2025/19 2111/20 questions [13] 1961/1 1985/1 2000/22 2000/23 2000/23 2001/8 2007/11 2007/12 2019/14 2022/2 2041/5 2097/23 2105/6 quick [4] 1943/3 2013/6 2028/7 2106/22 quickly [4] 1948/15 1951/5 1951/18 2044/8 quite [1] 2020/24 quote [10] 1946/7 1975/1 2002/9 2008/18 2008/24 2024/25 2026/13 2026/13 2114/17 2114/18 quote/unquote [1] 2008/24

# R

rachet [1] 2114/11 rain [3] 2012/4 2012/8 2012/8 raining [1] 2012/6 raised [2] 2036/22 2117/21 raises [1] 2095/24 raising [1] 2026/24 ran [4] 2034/14 2034/17 2040/1 2090/24 rarely [1] 2105/16 ratcheting [1] 1944/12 rather [2] 1969/22 2035/10 re [1] 2089/20 re-patron [1] 2089/20 reach [2] 2046/9 2081/9 reached [2] 1992/10 2005/16 reacted [1] 2039/23 reaction [1] 1962/7 read [16] 1958/11 1994/6 1994/6 1994/6 1994/7 2001/12 2006/14 2018/23 2021/13 2022/2 2042/20 2060/2 2062/19 2067/6 2093/17 2115/21 readable [1] 2074/21 reader [1] 1961/15 reading [1] 1961/15 ready [7] 1989/17 1990/6 2078/20 2108/8 2119/19 2119/22 2122/5 real [17] 1968/20 1985/13 1996/2 2003/19 2037/13 2044/14 2073/17 2077/9 2089/18 2097/9 2097/15 2100/17 2102/6 2113/1 2120/5 2121/7 2121/8 realized [1] 1962/11 really [45] 1940/12 1980/7 1982/13

```
R
really... [42] 1990/25 1991/7 1991/13
1991/20 1993/13 1994/15 1996/8
1997/3 1998/12 2005/15 2009/21
2019/15 2026/24 2036/25 2037/13
2038/25 2041/5 2041/10 2044/13
2044/25 2045/5 2045/10 2045/12
2045/17 2045/18 2055/3 2055/3
2062/9 2062/9 2062/9 2062/10
2062/10 2062/11 2062/22 2062/25
2065/5 2065/6 2067/11 2086/18
2090/19 2114/7 2120/2
reason [29] 1943/3 1947/10 1947/23
1977/8 1988/16 2012/13 2022/16
2044/20 2067/14 2068/6 2076/15
2076/17 2076/17 2079/9 2081/16
2088/20 2094/3 2095/4 2095/12
2096/23 2100/8 2100/24 2102/17
2112/3 2112/4 2113/2 2117/10
2117/11 2120/7
reasonable [23] 1940/11 1953/13
1959/6 1961/14 1961/21 1987/19
1998/7 2019/19 2037/17 2037/22
2040/9 2040/19 2054/23 2057/13
2062/16 2067/1 2071/7 2071/12
2095/24 2098/22 2103/18 2116/18
reasonably [3] 1954/11 2005/10 2038/4
reasons [9] 1977/13 1993/24 2016/5
2025/15 2029/11 2032/14 2100/24
2100/25 2102/16
rebut [1] 1935/9
rebuttal [7] 1935/9 1937/8 1966/7
2091/24 2107/14 2108/6 2119/11
recalling [1] 2023/3
recap [1] 2024/10
recapitulate [1] 2023/15
receive [1] 1964/24
received [18] 1963/3 1967/21 1969/15
1975/11 1975/15 1979/2 1979/10
1979/18 1981/2 1981/5 1982/5 1982/6
1982/8 1985/6 2102/11 2113/23
2114/8 2114/9
receives [1] 1985/5
receiving [7] 1943/7 1950/5 1952/6
1980/7 1981/22 2115/6 2118/16
recency [1] 1991/3
recently [1] 1946/20
recess [3] 1990/3 2023/25 2092/4
recipients [1] 2044/15
recollection [2] 1979/5 2020/20
recommendation [1] 1992/15
recommended [1] 1992/17
recommending [1] 2121/18
record [21] 1949/22 1978/1 1990/1
1990/2 1990/9 1990/10 1995/11
1995/15 2004/25 2014/25 2026/3
2034/15 2034/16 2038/18 2059/11
2060/18 2060/21 2069/14 2101/20
2115/17 2118/18
record's [1] 2087/13
recorded [3] 1933/25 1945/16 2082/17
recording [12] 2005/21 2084/18
2085/11 2085/20 2085/22 2085/23
2086/10 2086/10 2086/11 2086/11
2086/13 2086/15
records [17] 1967/19 1971/16 1972/13
1977/18 1978/7 1992/1 1994/4
```

```
1994/19 1954/1391995/4 1997/21
2013/22 2015/2 2018/22 2026/8
2035/2 2040/24
recover [5] 1995/21 1997/9 2020/11
2026/25 2035/16
recruited [2] 2098/6 2098/19
red [2] 1975/7 1975/9
redact [1] 2117/3
redacted [5] 1948/10 1948/11 2078/12
2080/20 2090/5
redactions [1] 2090/2
reenacting [1] 1994/5
refer [1] 1993/17
reference [3] 1984/5 1996/5 2120/8
referenced [5] 1975/3 1975/4 2052/21
2098/13 2121/9
references [5] 1937/16 2004/10 2074/1
2120/5 2121/5
referred [5] 1976/16 1992/23 2005/12
2027/15 2052/8
referring [3] 2003/9 2039/16 2099/10
refers [1] 2074/1
reflect [1] 1998/23
reflected [1] 1970/10
reflecting [1] 1978/25
reflects [2] 1983/11 1997/24
refresh [1] 2072/19
refusal [1] 1983/9
refused [2] 1947/13 2069/19
regard [12] 1991/19 2016/22 2031/9
2036/19 2037/15 2038/7 2040/9
2042/18 2043/19 2044/24 2065/9
2067/3
regarding [3] 2015/1 2052/9 2071/4
regular [1] 1969/15
regularly [1] 1971/25
reiterate [2] 2026/24 2047/18
reiterated [1] 2025/23
reject [2] 2114/25 2119/1
relate [1] 2001/6
related [4] 1941/12 1949/13 1960/10
2090/18
relates [1] 2113/4
relating [5] 1965/21 1977/13 1978/12
1979/1 2049/16
relationship [1] 2007/9
relatively [1] 1953/20
relax [1] 2091/22
released [1] 1978/14
relentless [1] 1939/5
relevant [6] 1984/22 1985/10 2018/25
2034/14 2043/6 2043/6
rely [1] 2109/16
remain [2] 2039/9 2072/19
remained [2] 2039/4 2039/10
remaining [1] 2120/1
remember [60] 1966/4 1966/7 1991/2
1991/9 1994/9 1997/7 1998/22
1999/11 2000/20 2001/11 2006/16
2007/1 2007/8 2007/17 2010/3 2010/6
2020/4 2023/18 2024/24 2026/14
2028/1 2034/10 2035/4 2039/12
2041/4 2043/11 2045/1 2048/24
2050/1 2052/25 2055/10 2055/12
2057/17 2059/20 2060/13 2065/18
2070/12 2070/13 2071/25 2073/3
2074/4 2074/14 2076/8 2081/8
2084/17 2084/25 2088/11 2091/22
```

2093/25 2096/7 2097/24 2100/6 2100/7 2102/25 2103/4 2104/11 2105/6 2116/14 2118/8 2119/8 remembered [2] 1978/20 2049/22 remind [12] 1937/14 1996/7 1998/21 2001/16 2005/25 2007/18 2013/6 2025/3 2049/5 2054/18 2070/11 2104/1 remote [1] 2088/22 removed [1] 2074/16 RENEE [1] 1933/20 repaid [1] 2026/2 repatriate [5] 1973/11 1987/15 1995/25 2022/14 2045/20 repaying [1] 2001/4 repeat [2] 2054/21 2065/19 repeated [1] 1971/22 repeatedly [2] 1987/23 2098/25 repeating [1] 2017/23 repercussions [1] 2064/2 replace [1] 2120/3 replay [2] 2058/13 2058/13 reply [1] 2001/23 report [18] 1944/14 1975/21 1975/22 1982/23 2014/10 2014/18 2016/3 2031/10 2042/20 2042/20 2042/23 2043/13 2052/9 2052/21 2089/24 2090/12 2090/12 2090/14 reported [6] 1982/11 1982/15 1982/21 2004/13 2017/17 2039/5 Reporter [1] 1933/22 reporting [1] 2118/20 reports [13] 1944/16 1998/2 1998/2 2014/16 2014/19 2015/21 2015/24 2015/25 2016/6 2016/13 2016/19 2022/2 2118/17 representative [3] 1948/21 2086/22 2089/17 represents [1] 2036/22 Republic [6] 2011/19 2012/20 2012/24 2019/19 2020/1 2045/18 request [5] 1937/19 1939/24 1979/6 2026/19 2072/5 requested [3] 1943/11 1943/14 2071/22 require [1] 1965/3 required [3] 2041/10 2070/5 2113/15 requirement [1] 2038/19 requirements [1] 2038/7 requires [3] 1953/24 2002/12 2031/22 research [5] 1941/20 1989/19 2023/19 2091/22 2119/9 researching [1] 1942/3 residence [2] 1988/6 2117/12 residences [2] 2040/25 2043/1 residing [1] 2071/10 resolve [1] 1944/6 resources [1] 1956/21 respect [10] 1937/2 1962/13 1964/6 1965/7 1968/12 1973/10 1974/12 1987/8 2066/6 2105/12 respectful [1] 2066/24 respectfully [2] 2011/11 2036/21 respects [1] 2116/6 respond [2] 1958/7 2109/8 responded [2] 1972/19 1972/24 responds [6] 1957/21 1957/22 1957/24 1976/24 2036/13 2036/14

running [2] 2018<del>4/</del>9 2106/7 runs [2] 1987/6 2091/3

Sabrina [5] 1944/19 1950/1 1950/1 1962/25 2042/19 Sabrina Xu's [1] 1944/19 safe [8] 1938/21 1939/5 1951/4 1963/25 1964/4 1986/14 1989/6 2111/18 safely [2] 2114/25 2119/1 safety [6] 1938/15 1947/11 1960/24 1961/16 1964/1 1989/2 sat [3] 1998/4 1999/20 2009/20 satisfied [3] 1954/25 2035/12 2038/18 satisfy [1] 2071/16 saved [2] 1970/13 2058/19 saw [42] 1952/13 1952/14 1956/3 1957/16 1957/25 1958/21 1962/7 1962/8 1962/10 1971/23 1982/16 1985/20 1996/3 1996/5 1996/8 1996/15 1996/17 1996/23 1998/10 2007/24 2009/12 2010/15 2027/12 2029/24 2030/20 2031/20 2039/18 2044/10 2045/8 2045/22 2046/6 2057/4 2057/19 2109/11 2111/15 2111/15 2114/6 2114/8 2114/20 2116/13 2116/23 2117/15 scare [3] 1939/6 1958/6 2039/15 scared [8] 1949/2 1952/2 1963/15 2044/16 2044/16 2045/5 2045/11 2045/13 scaring [1] 1958/2 scenario [1] 2032/21 scene [1] 2113/24 schedule [1] 2023/10 scheme [15] 1942/12 1946/17 1948/14 1948/15 1955/11 1955/25 1956/12 1959/5 1959/6 2016/9 2060/8 2088/8 2110/3 2110/18 2116/3 scope [1] 2073/21 screaming [1] 2057/7 screen [5] 1940/23 2036/12 2078/19 2078/24 2089/25 scribe [1] 2034/1 search [1] 1975/16 searched [1] 1993/24 seat [3] 1934/2 1990/8 2119/17 seated [4] 1936/18 1990/13 2024/5 2093/6 sec [1] 1993/3 second [27] 1941/11 1953/8 1954/7 1964/16 1965/12 1966/2 1968/12 1990/1 1990/9 1991/22 1996/21 1999/11 2008/17 2037/24 2040/21 2049/3 2053/23 2056/24 2058/17 2065/3 2065/12 2079/1 2080/11 2090/7 2090/7 2107/19 2121/17 secondly [2] 1934/13 1959/25 seconds [2] 2058/20 2083/5 secret [4] 1973/6 2012/19 2013/11 2013/13 secretly [1] 2017/4 Securities [1] 2104/17 security [7] 1941/9 1956/17 1970/5 1978/3 1978/7 1995/5 2074/12 seek [1] 2046/21 seeking [2] 1949/16 1997/9

seeks [1] 2033/11 seem [1] 2029/20 self [1] 2094/2 sending [2] 1934/11 1956/4 sends [5] 1975/20 1976/25 1976/25 2036/11 2090/12 sense [23] 1985/2 1989/11 1994/21 2001/9 2005/15 2012/13 2015/16 2019/4 2019/14 2028/25 2030/2 2031/7 2032/7 2033/6 2033/7 2034/4 2034/5 2088/17 2090/19 2109/15 2109/17 2118/4 2118/25 sensitive [8] 1941/7 1941/16 1943/18 1943/24 1969/13 1971/15 1978/2 2117/1 sent [29] 1937/15 1937/18 1938/12 1938/22 1938/24 1942/7 1944/14 1944/17 1947/18 1948/12 1950/2 1950/7 1950/14 1958/14 1960/6 1970/8 1975/19 1975/24 1976/3 1976/20 1978/2 1979/14 2030/25 2043/24 2044/7 2073/3 2080/7 2093/22 2103/13 sentence [3] 1995/2 1995/3 2106/22 separate [2] 1953/4 2063/9 separated [1] 2047/11 separately [2] 1953/6 1953/9 September [20] 1940/19 1940/24 1950/11 1950/16 1961/3 1967/11 1968/1 1968/7 1969/8 1971/25 1974/24 2041/11 2043/24 2045/13 2054/24 2054/25 2055/1 2055/1 2060/23 2082/17 September 2016 [5] 1940/19 1940/24 1968/7 1971/25 2082/17 September 2018 [3] 1950/11 2043/24 2045/13 September 3rd [1] 2055/1 September 4 [1] 1961/3 September 4th [3] 1950/16 2055/1 2060/23 series [3] 1963/2 2108/17 2118/9 serious [2] 2064/1 2098/22 seriously [1] 2064/4 served [1] 1968/1 service [6] 2073/21 2078/3 2078/4 2084/10 2084/14 2084/16 session [2] 2050/11 2050/12 set [8] 1935/14 1989/25 2011/4 2016/14 2025/15 2063/13 2063/15 2107/17 seven [1] 1993/11 several [6] 1944/22 1945/17 1956/20 1973/21 1973/22 1995/17 severe [1] 2056/5 shaded [1] 2090/8 shake [1] 2064/12 shall [1] 1977/16 shape [4] 2049/12 2055/14 2055/14 2106/3 share [3] 1988/14 1988/16 2094/25 shared [8] 1952/24 1953/2 1953/22 1977/10 1977/12 1978/8 2013/22 2033/25 shattered [1] 1989/1 sheer [1] 2116/25 sheet [2] 1956/7 2120/6 Sheng [1] 1980/25

S Shi [11] 1992/8 1992/8 1992/10 2071/24 2072/5 2072/10 2072/17 2076/21 2090/10 2096/21 2096/24 shifting [1] 1993/8 shocking [3] 1959/17 1959/24 1959/24 short [15] 1993/21 2014/7 2014/11 2040/23 2044/1 2044/6 2044/7 2044/9 2086/25 2087/1 2101/9 2101/24 2102/4 2102/13 2117/18 Short Hills [1] 2040/23 shortly [1] 2082/11 shot [2] 1936/24 2036/12 shown [25] 1953/12 1953/21 1968/25 1987/20 1987/22 1987/25 1988/2 1988/4 1988/9 1988/11 1988/12 1988/15 1988/17 1988/19 1988/21 1988/23 1988/25 1989/3 1989/5 1989/8 1992/24 1994/15 2003/24 2034/8 2097/14 shred [1] 2109/23 sick [1] 1938/12 side [5] 1999/20 2023/5 2023/5 2054/5 2062/18 sides [2] 2054/1 2054/2 sight [1] 2058/17 sign [3] 2076/18 2077/8 2079/12 Signal [1] 2017/3 signalling [1] 1983/8 signed [5] 1941/3 1969/9 2079/5 2079/9 2084/6 significance [2] 1975/18 1983/6 significant [1] 2113/16 significantly [1] 2087/23 similar [5] 2014/17 2088/23 2089/7 2098/17 2105/25 similarly [2] 1965/16 2120/23 simple [3] 1939/3 1954/23 2063/20 simply [6] 1954/16 1966/8 2029/14 2088/19 2088/20 2116/23 sincerely [1] 2107/6 single [6] 1939/3 1966/11 2020/15 2020/16 2112/16 2116/24 sinister [1] 2029/20 sister [26] 1938/8 1938/24 1938/25 1942/7 1945/2 1945/23 1947/15 1947/18 1947/20 1947/22 1947/24 1948/1 1949/18 1952/5 1952/7 1952/8 1952/15 1960/6 1963/3 1963/9 1963/12 1963/12 1969/20 1993/20 2041/3 2101/9 sister's [2] 1972/10 2102/7 sit [5] 1958/5 2039/14 2054/7 2099/16 2111/8 site [6] 1994/14 1996/23 1999/4 2005/24 2016/25 2017/6 sits [1] 2030/11 sitting [7] 1949/1 1963/6 2050/9 2051/25 2064/20 2068/15 2069/1 situation [3] 2088/23 2089/7 2097/17 situations [1] 2098/10 six [3] 1993/16 2047/12 2083/16 SKYNET [8] 2020/14 2020/17 2020/18 2021/12 2021/15 2021/16 2021/17 2021/20 slang [1] 2099/6 sleep [2] 1963/14 2119/13 slide [3] 1940/5 1982/10 1982/12

slides [2] 1940/42103/7 slower [1] 1994/10 small [5] 1941/9 1982/19 1993/1 1995/8 2084/19 smart [5] 2064/7 2064/22 2064/22 2064/23 2064/24 so-called [3] 2059/7 2059/24 2088/8 social [5] 1941/9 1978/3 1995/5 2115/24 2115/25 somewhat [1] 2062/13 somewhere [3] 2058/10 2075/23 2105/22 son [12] 1946/23 1947/5 1947/5 1947/7 1947/8 1957/9 1983/4 2028/20 2029/23 2030/4 2030/14 2030/17 son's [6] 1980/16 1980/19 1981/9 1981/18 1997/20 2028/21 soon [1] 1981/15 sophisticated [2] 2074/9 2106/13 sort [12] 1992/21 1993/7 2011/13 2012/19 2015/15 2016/6 2017/20 2029/19 2053/8 2058/17 2099/7 2116/14 sorting [1] 2103/20 sorts [3] 1936/2 1997/2 2017/3 sought [2] 1984/7 1992/6 sound [2] 2028/5 2031/1 sounds [1] 2121/3 sources [3] 1981/3 1981/20 1982/7 speaking [3] 1992/7 2013/11 2069/7 speaks [1] 1961/13 spec [1] 1997/17 special [7] 1966/21 1977/24 1978/18 1979/4 2021/2 2033/12 2040/22 Special Agent Tarkin [1] 2040/22 specific [4] 1973/9 2010/2 2042/23 2108/18 specifically [5] 1969/11 1977/9 1983/19 1999/19 2044/25 speculate [1] 2075/15 speculation [2] 2042/16 2102/24 spelled [2] 2099/9 2099/9 spend [6] 1951/3 1986/13 1987/4 2074/14 2111/18 2112/19 spent [7] 1938/20 1989/7 2020/23 2029/5 2109/5 2112/24 2112/25 spite [1] 2050/15 spoken [2] 1934/23 2025/21 spontaneously [1] 2087/5 sporadic [2] 2082/11 2087/23 spot [1] 1991/1 spring [1] 1944/20 stalk [4] 1955/18 1957/6 1988/18 2056/9 stalked [4] 1938/5 1939/10 1939/16 1952/18 stalking [29] 1949/5 1953/9 1953/19 1954/2 1954/15 1954/19 1955/4 1955/9 1955/25 1957/4 1958/20 1960/11 1962/16 1962/17 1963/8 1964/6 1965/17 2024/20 2037/18 2037/19 2037/21 2047/12 2052/16 2056/8 2058/14 2067/12 2068/24 2070/10 2116/5 stand [9] 1998/4 2054/8 2070/1 2070/4 2070/6 2071/25 2097/9 2099/12 2104/14

Standby [1] 2002/10

standing [2] 1942/23 1996/11 stands [1] 2032/7 Stanford [3] 2042/22 2042/25 2043/3 start [22] 1937/3 1937/5 1953/19 1974/22 1987/17 1991/21 1997/16 2000/20 2001/24 2004/15 2020/2 2036/15 2080/16 2080/25 2092/3 2107/14 2108/5 2109/21 2112/20 2112/21 2116/10 2119/18 started [12] 1952/5 1959/20 1990/5 2024/11 2024/16 2037/13 2045/7 2048/25 2052/24 2061/5 2084/3 2088/15 starting [4] 1950/4 1955/7 2065/19 2087/25 state [5] 1956/22 1957/22 1973/4 2048/8 2048/9 statement [13] 1966/1 1983/11 1998/5 2024/24 2025/2 2025/16 2027/20 2030/6 2052/18 2103/14 2110/20 2110/24 2111/22 statements [4] 1937/16 2025/22 2110/11 2117/25 states [45] 1933/1 1933/3 1933/3 1933/10 1933/13 1933/17 1938/1 1942/18 1943/20 1945/12 1945/20 1946/19 1946/22 1947/19 1948/6 1955/14 1955/22 1956/8 1956/14 1964/20 1967/16 1968/18 1970/4 1972/21 1984/3 1987/22 1995/17 2048/6 2048/8 2068/5 2071/10 2071/21 2071/23 2073/10 2074/25 2075/3 2083/21 2083/21 2089/11 2089/12 2089/20 2100/20 2105/17 2105/20 2105/23 stay [1] 2002/12 stayed [1] 1962/2 staying [1] 2009/7 stenography [1] 1933/25 step [2] 1954/23 2005/14 steps [4] 1957/1 1957/3 2026/2 2113/18 stick [2] 2076/6 2077/12 stipulated [1] 1968/14 stipulation [1] 2014/25 stock [1] 2026/9 stolen [2] 2000/20 2020/9 stood [2] 1987/18 1991/18 stop [4] 2107/15 2108/6 2114/16 2119/6 store [1] 2053/10 stored [1] 1978/11 story [5] 1992/6 2010/4 2010/7 2010/8 2071/19 straightforward [2] 1953/20 2103/24 stranger [1] 1938/22 Strangers [2] 1938/7 1938/17 stressed [1] 1950/8 stretch [1] 2030/22 stretching [1] 2036/23 strictly [2] 1977/18 2035/1 strongly [1] 2039/24 structure [4] 1973/5 1974/7 2070/16 2070/17 structures [1] 2105/7 student [6] 1980/16 1980/19 1981/9 1981/18 2029/24 2042/24 studying [1] 2020/23

## S

stuff [6] 1936/9 2000/6 2004/2 2044/6 2044/9 2062/19 stupid [1] 2061/4 subcontracted [1] 2013/19 subject [8] 1966/19 1975/21 1976/4 2020/8 2073/24 2080/8 2120/3 2121/19 subject's [1] 2073/24 subjects [1] 2026/18 submit [6] 2071/15 2095/24 2102/23 2104/18 2109/10 2109/25 subpoena [3] 2054/1 2054/2 2072/1 subpoenaed [1] 2072/2 subsequent [1] 2089/3 subsequently [1] 1980/20 substantial [11] 1954/12 1955/17 1959/4 1960/9 1961/20 2038/5 2038/22 2044/21 2062/15 2063/10 2110/1 substantiates [1] 2087/7 substantive [4] 2112/23 2113/1 2113/5 2115/1 success [2] 1936/22 1957/4 successful [1] 1958/18 suddenly [1] 2113/7 suffer [1] 1960/3 suffered [3] 1946/20 1963/11 2044/21 sufficient [5] 1964/25 2062/3 2099/17 2103/23 2106/10 suggested [4] 1948/16 1958/22 2111/6 2112/1 suggesting [2] 1948/21 2111/5 suggestion [4] 2002/10 2047/19 2063/12 2118/6 suggests [1] 1956/10 Suites [4] 1996/24 1999/24 2005/22 2009/20 summarize [4] 1939/19 1969/7 1974/17 1983/14 summarized [1] 2040/22 summarizing [1] 2012/16 summary [3] 1974/24 2082/17 2107/8 summation [8] 1935/12 1937/6 1937/11 2014/5 2024/7 2024/23 2027/12 2067/23 summations [3] 1934/8 1937/3 1937/7 summed [2] 2007/2 2008/21 summer [1] 1950/4 Sun [11] 1940/25 1966/12 1967/9 1970/4 1970/8 1971/24 1996/16 2073/4 2105/1 2118/12 2118/16 Sun Hui [1] 1996/16 support [1] 1984/18 supported [2] 2043/17 2109/19 supports [1] 2094/6 suppose [2] 2065/3 2112/21 supposed [9] 1952/16 1975/5 2020/18 2055/15 2056/20 2090/4 2090/13 2090/23 2100/10 supposedly [5] 1952/7 1976/8 2054/14 2055/18 2060/7 surgery [1] 1959/19 surrounding [2] 2106/10 2115/18 surveil [2] 1945/14 1988/1 surveillance [61] 1942/3 1943/23 1946/2 1954/8 1956/3 1957/2 1957/20 1958/1 1958/4 1962/18 1962/22

1967/11 19**67/1452**1968/18 1969/19 1972/9 1972/11 1972/12 1976/9 1976/17 1977/12 1977/19 1983/23 1988/5 1988/7 1993/15 1994/1 1994/15 1994/18 1997/1 2003/5 2007/13 2007/19 2007/20 2007/23 2007/24 2008/11 2008/12 2008/13 2008/14 2013/3 2013/21 2014/7 2014/20 2019/10 2035/2 2038/1 2039/5 2039/8 2039/9 2039/13 2040/4 2040/7 2040/11 2040/14 2040/15 2040/17 2041/10 2044/23 2047/10 2101/12 surveilled [3] 1939/10 1942/6 1988/11 surveilling [1] 1957/19 survive [1] 1945/21 suspects [1] 2019/7 sustain [1] 2084/24 Sustained [10] 2046/13 2047/3 2047/3 2054/17 2054/17 2066/13 2075/13 2076/5 2077/11 2084/24 swayed [1] 2037/2 switch [1] 2003/5 switched [1] 1981/16 sympathetic [1] 2106/18 sympathy [1] 2106/20 system [8] 1973/4 2000/9 2000/13 2048/7 2048/15 2051/23 2064/14 2070/5 systems [2] 2048/11 2105/9

table [6] 1960/22 1963/6 2009/8 2051/25 2064/20 2083/4 tacit [1] 1934/17 tactic [1] 1957/13 talks [2] 2060/10 2115/14 tape [5] 2005/21 2008/8 2057/4 2057/4 2067/15 tape-recording [1] 2005/21 taped [2] 1950/22 1960/23 target [10] 2052/14 2080/8 2093/22 2094/8 2095/11 2096/9 2103/3 2103/9 2103/15 2103/16 targeted [1] 1949/25 Tarkin [1] 2040/22 task [5] 1946/23 1946/24 1947/1 1947/4 1947/6 tasked [3] 1945/7 1983/18 1987/24 tax [8] 1982/12 1982/15 2018/25 2031/10 2031/20 2031/20 2032/16 2032/17 taxes [7] 1997/20 2016/17 2017/24 2031/9 2031/18 2031/21 2032/21 teach [1] 1936/19 team [1] 1946/10 technical [2] 2038/19 2074/7 technically [1] 2058/24 technique [2] 1936/20 1949/3 technologies [1] 2074/10 technology [2] 2069/11 2074/19 telephone [1] 2087/16 telephones [1] 2052/6 teller [1] 2055/11 ten [1] 2086/12 terminate [1] 2113/18 terminated [3] 2083/10 2084/10 2116/12

terms [15] 1936/9 2000/19 2001/13 2018/5 2024/16 2034/6 2036/16 2048/23 2049/6 2051/6 2053/18 2056/7 2064/14 2065/24 2066/2 terrible [3] 1958/8 2012/25 2061/1 terrific [1] 2060/17 terrified [4] 1939/11 1951/19 2044/15 2113/23 terrifying [1] 1985/19 terrorized [1] 1937/25 testified [22] 1947/2 1950/6 1999/19 2000/5 2007/20 2013/20 2021/11 2022/1 2033/14 2043/4 2043/10 2045/6 2045/10 2048/21 2049/18 2049/18 2068/18 2068/22 2074/20 2082/16 2097/25 2097/25 testify [9] 1999/17 2050/24 2059/10 2066/18 2068/18 2070/1 2070/4 2094/1 2097/10 testifying [1] 2031/19 testimony [27] 1937/18 1939/25 1944/4 1944/15 1944/19 1947/9 1957/16 1966/22 1978/18 1985/23 1986/2 2005/19 2007/10 2016/23 2018/19 2021/24 2040/23 2042/9 2044/11 2045/2 2049/21 2052/8 2060/13 2072/1 2072/3 2099/2 2105/14 text [16] 1957/25 1958/9 1958/11 1958/14 1976/21 1978/2 1984/3 1984/6 1994/5 1997/25 2001/19 2002/2 2015/6 2033/18 2074/23 2075/6 texted [1] 1948/16 texting [2] 1939/4 1948/9 texts [5] 2000/17 2001/12 2010/10 2011/17 2013/18 theme [1] 2018/18 themselves [7] 1952/8 2019/3 2019/16 2105/2 2111/9 2120/4 2120/8 theory [1] 2029/25 thereafter [3] 2082/11 2083/6 2087/25 therefore [3] 1964/1 2007/7 2089/18 thinking [3] 2022/9 2022/12 2063/23 thinks [4] 2000/15 2003/14 2059/3 2066/7 thinner [2] 1963/14 1963/14 third [8] 1951/13 1954/10 1954/22 1964/18 1965/14 2038/2 2090/7 2090/8 thousand [2] 1980/9 1980/17 thousands [2] 2103/20 2107/7 threat [4] 1962/5 1962/6 1962/10 1962/11 threaten [3] 1950/15 1961/11 1985/6 threatened [7] 1938/5 1939/10 1950/6 1960/24 1967/25 1989/5 2055/13 threatening [8] 1938/19 1950/22 1951/13 1960/17 1961/13 1962/23 1988/25 1989/4 threats [5] 1938/15 1950/12 1952/20 1962/9 2057/7 three [42] 1937/24 1942/23 1950/22 1951/9 1954/14 1954/17 1955/3 1962/14 1964/5 1964/6 1981/5 1981/8 1985/18 2004/21 2005/5 2005/12 2028/11 2037/8 2039/2 2050/6

2056/22 2057/3 2057/21 2060/10

2063/7 2069/1 2082/6 2082/22 2083/2

transpiring [1912466/2 transportation [1] 2084/16 trauma [1] 1962/4 traumatized [2] 1963/8 1963/8 travel [17] 1941/12 1943/2 1943/15 1946/21 1948/24 1949/22 1955/13 1956/9 1959/2 1960/14 1961/18 1967/19 1971/17 1972/13 2038/3 2038/13 2038/17 traveled [12] 1942/15 1942/17 1945/8 1954/5 1955/21 1956/14 1956/22 1956/25 1957/6 2037/23 2037/24 2038/9 traveling [3] 1945/1 1979/23 2101/20 travels [1] 2100/3 treated [1] 1982/10 treaty [1] 2045/24 triad [1] 2055/16 trial [16] 1933/9 1936/2 1937/4 1939/13 1953/12 1987/17 1996/18 2016/9 2027/12 2031/13 2040/22 2066/17 2071/15 2074/5 2076/8 2109/12 trick [1] 2069/10 trip [5] 1938/15 1945/21 1947/10 1947/13 1959/16 trips [1] 2100/22 trouble [3] 1944/6 2029/13 2029/14 true [14] 1968/15 1988/17 1991/21 1997/21 2033/25 2042/8 2043/1 2089/19 2114/19 2117/13 2117/23 2117/24 2120/12 2120/13 truly [1] 2037/1 trust [2] 2008/9 2008/15 trusted [3] 2008/10 2009/14 2016/12 truth [4] 2049/15 2055/11 2065/2 2096/11 Tu [29] 1945/6 1945/6 1946/4 1946/6 1946/14 1946/25 1947/2 1947/16 1955/15 1955/19 1966/13 1967/13 1983/16 1983/17 1983/25 1984/12 1996/15 1999/24 2005/21 2006/4 2006/12 2006/16 2006/19 2007/6 2008/18 2009/16 2045/4 2100/8 2105/1 Tu Lan [13] 1945/6 1945/6 1946/4 1946/6 1946/14 1946/25 1947/2 1947/16 1996/15 1999/24 2045/4 2100/8 2105/1 Tuesday [1] 2001/25 tumblesaults [1] 2064/16 TUNG [20] 1933/21 1934/24 1935/5 1991/7 2067/23 2068/11 2075/14 2076/6 2076/11 2078/13 2078/16 2080/10 2091/12 2093/3 2093/6 2104/1 2106/19 2107/13 2116/12 2123/7 Tung's [2] 2022/2 2091/23 turn [12] 1934/13 1974/13 1987/3 1992/10 1992/13 2019/23 2037/3 2067/20 2108/19 2111/9 2111/10 2111/11 turned [3] 1963/21 1991/20 2045/3 turns [5] 2000/9 2027/18 2030/19 2058/21 2091/5 Twenty [2] 2060/8 2060/8 twice [1] 1996/4 twisted [1] 2010/17 twisting [1] 2115/20

two [67] 1934/5 1936/19 1940/7 1940/15 1944/7 1949/10 1950/14 1951/6 1951/11 1951/15 1953/4 1953/24 1957/17 1961/24 1962/8 1964/9 1964/13 1965/21 1968/8 1968/11 1979/17 1981/3 1981/4 1984/19 1987/8 1987/16 1996/12 2011/5 2013/4 2013/20 2015/1 2018/5 2030/11 2032/25 2036/20 2037/16 2042/2 2049/23 2050/16 2051/15 2051/22 2053/19 2055/3 2055/4 2055/25 2056/6 2056/11 2056/15 2057/20 2057/21 2057/23 2059/3 2059/20 2063/7 2063/9 2064/17 2065/23 2067/9 2068/6 2082/24 2101/9 2109/25 2110/21 2112/23 2112/23 2116/16 2118/13 two weeks [3] 1940/7 1940/15 1949/10 two-handed [1] 1936/19 two-year [1] 2032/25 type [2] 2015/13 2015/14 types [1] 2118/24 typo [5] 1958/22 1958/24 1958/25 1971/9 2111/6

U.S [17] 1943/19 1947/3 1947/17 1956/16 1959/23 1967/17 1978/22 1982/24 1985/9 2017/2 2021/2 2045/24 2050/19 2098/4 2100/2 2101/3 2106/8 umbrella [2] 2012/5 2012/8 un-redacted [2] 1948/11 2080/20 unambiguously [1] 2110/7 unanimously [1] 1990/24 unbelievable [1] 2006/1 uncertain [2] 2000/19 2001/13 unclear [2] 2040/10 2040/10 understandable [1] 2055/22 understandably [1] 2020/24 understood [12] 1958/14 1975/18 1983/11 1997/10 2005/9 2005/10 2006/9 2026/1 2026/25 2045/4 2111/1 2115/17 undertake [1] 2002/8 undisputed [4] 1940/8 1991/20 1996/19 1997/3 unfair [1] 2033/2 unfortunately [1] 2023/9 unguarded [1] 2008/8 unidentified [1] 2121/6 unifying [1] 2112/13 unimaginable [1] 1993/13 unit [1] 1972/25 UNITED [43] 1933/1 1933/3 1933/3 1933/10 1933/13 1933/17 1938/1 1942/18 1943/20 1945/12 1945/20 1946/19 1946/21 1947/19 1948/6 1955/22 1956/14 1964/20 1967/16 1968/18 1970/4 1972/21 1974/4 1984/3 1987/22 1995/17 2048/6 2048/8 2068/5 2071/10 2071/21 2071/23 2073/10 2075/3 2083/21 2083/21 2089/11 2089/12 2089/20 2100/20 2105/17 2105/19 2105/23 United States [13] 1972/21 1984/3

2068/5 2071/10 2071/21 2071/23

2073/10 2075/3 2083/21 2083/21

### U

United States... [3] 2089/11 2089/12 2089/20 University [2] 2042/22 2042/25 unjustly [2] 2044/18 2045/21 unknowing [1] 2107/1 unknowingly [3] 2069/3 2107/1 2107/4 unlawful [3] 2015/20 2015/23 2112/15 unlawfully [1] 2016/7 unless [4] 1935/3 1935/22 1958/24 2067/21 unlock [1] 1936/4 unquestionably [1] 1970/6 unquote [1] 2008/24 unredacted [1] 2078/10 unregistered [1] 2030/25 unsafe [2] 1950/8 1962/3 unsolicited [1] 1952/6 unsupported [1] 2039/20 unsure [1] 2114/5 unwanted [1] 1952/6 unwarranted [1] 2033/2 unwilling [1] 1960/19 update [2] 1942/10 1978/5 updates [1] 1969/15 upholding [1] 2109/4 upper [1] 2082/14 upsetting [1] 1952/16 upside [3] 1963/21 2037/3 2108/19 urge [2] 1937/5 2086/23 user [3] 2034/23 2034/25 2036/17 users [1] 2035/6 uses [2] 2016/1 2027/5 utilize [1] 2069/12

vacuum [1] 1985/4 valid [1] 1978/15 vapes [1] 2030/16 various [5] 1945/11 2036/3 2051/5 2052/5 2052/6 vehicle [9] 1972/10 1976/15 1976/18 1977/14 1991/25 2015/13 2015/14 2034/10 2036/17 verdict [5] 1989/10 1989/12 2047/6 2047/6 2107/10 verge [1] 1963/13 Verizon [1] 2016/24 version [4] 1948/11 2078/10 2078/12 2113/25 versions [1] 2090/5 vetoed [1] 2039/19 via [1] 1943/8 victim [7] 1971/15 1978/2 2010/20 2011/11 2046/1 2116/16 2118/4 victim's [1] 1944/23 victims [38] 1939/16 1940/18 1941/8 1941/18 1943/24 1943/25 1944/24 1955/12 1955/16 1956/1 1956/17 1958/2 1958/20 1962/18 1963/8 1965/23 1967/11 1967/15 1967/20 1967/21 1969/14 1986/1 1988/2 1988/12 1988/14 1988/18 2020/24 2038/23 2039/3 2059/24 2088/17 2088/21 2106/12 2110/10 2111/7 2115/19 2117/4 2120/5 victims' [5] 2088/21 2108/19 2114/13 2120/12 2120/13

video [18] 1**935/25** 1938/25 1952/14 1952/15 1958/5 1961/8 1961/9 1996/3 2044/9 2045/22 2046/7 2057/7 2057/22 2058/12 2084/17 2086/25 2086/25 2087/1 videos [4] 1935/16 1963/2 2039/14 2073/25 videotape [6] 2009/12 2010/6 2010/16 2010/18 2025/4 2057/5 view [7] 1966/5 1966/7 2025/23 2036/22 2052/23 2052/24 2067/10 Vincent [13] 1950/17 1951/5 1960/12 1960/15 1961/2 1985/10 1986/2 1987/5 2048/25 2052/18 2068/22 2114/4 2114/18 Vincent Kuang [4] 1950/17 1951/5 1987/5 2048/25 Vincent Kuang's [1] 2052/18 violated [4] 1977/11 2034/9 2034/23 2034/25 violating [2] 2036/16 2075/25 violation [2] 2037/5 2050/19 virtue [1] 2034/8 visit [2] 1960/1 1962/20 voice [3] 2082/14 2083/13 2083/13 volume [1] 2116/25 volumes [1] 2037/12

W wad [1] 1980/9 wait [1] 2103/10 waited [1] 2046/16 waiting [2] 1957/18 1957/21 walk [3] 1940/5 1953/12 2106/1 walked [5] 1950/19 1987/9 2012/3 2012/5 2059/5 walking [2] 1950/23 2058/22 walks [2] 2058/16 2058/21 Wang [2] 2077/3 2077/7 wants [8] 1935/19 2002/3 2003/13 2055/13 2055/13 2056/2 2059/7 2081/19 war [1] 2105/21 warn [3] 2046/10 2047/4 2105/17 warned [2] 2022/16 2101/2 warning [4] 1978/9 1978/13 2022/3 2105/24 warnings [5] 2105/16 2105/23 2105/25 2106/10 2106/10 Warren [11] 1993/22 2014/7 2014/18 2040/23 2042/3 2043/23 2044/2 2044/3 2044/6 2102/6 2117/12 waste [1] 2086/12 watch [4] 2053/10 2105/20 2111/22 2114/20 watched [1] 2100/9 watches [1] 2055/22 watching [1] 1948/3 ways [3] 1944/7 1949/17 2112/6 weakened [1] 1959/19 weapons [1] 2014/15 web [1] 2106/2 WeChat [8] 2017/2 2017/8 2077/1 2077/2 2077/6 2077/7 2077/8 2077/20 Wedeman [8] 1973/3 1973/5 1973/10 1983/5 2020/22 2021/25 2022/1 2070/12

Wedeman's [2] 1974/1 2021/24

week [4] 2003/7 2005/20 2044/10 2045/22 weeks [8] 1940/7 1940/15 1943/10 1949/10 1971/14 1980/20 2065/23 2109/25 weight [1] 2033/8 Welcome [1] 2024/5 wet [1] 2012/5 whack [1] 2060/3 WhatsApp [1] 2017/2 whatsoever [10] 1996/14 2043/13 2047/22 2053/11 2054/5 2054/7 2059/23 2079/8 2083/23 2105/25 Wheeler [4] 1999/3 1999/4 2017/6 2052/4 wheels [1] 1956/2 whereabouts [2] 2042/18 2073/25 whip [1] 2064/22 whole [14] 1997/1 2000/9 2000/13 2006/25 2008/7 2010/1 2019/3 2027/7 2038/10 2039/18 2040/4 2056/17 2114/21 2118/2 wide [1] 1934/25 wife [19] 1937/25 1938/16 1938/20 1947/11 1949/8 1951/3 1952/11 1968/2 1980/1 1980/23 1981/1 1981/9 1981/17 1986/14 1989/6 1995/4 2027/15 2028/16 2028/24 willing [5] 1951/1 1986/13 2004/15 2045/19 2064/15 window [1] 1961/25 windows [1] 2012/3 wins [1] 2000/12 wire [11] 1979/18 1979/19 1979/20 1979/21 1979/23 1979/25 1981/6 1981/6 1982/7 2004/21 2005/7 wired [1] 2028/14 wiring [1] 2005/12 wish [2] 2045/20 2067/17 wishes [1] 2045/17 withdraw [4] 2058/25 2059/7 2113/15 2114/14 withdrawal [5] 2112/25 2113/3 2113/4 2113/25 2114/9 withdrawn [1] 2113/17 withdraws [1] 2113/19 withdrew [2] 2061/6 2114/24 witness [24] 1939/25 1994/5 1994/5 1998/2 1998/4 1998/4 1999/8 2009/10 2011/16 2017/19 2033/14 2033/19 2053/16 2053/24 2054/7 2054/12 2068/17 2068/21 2070/12 2095/23 2097/15 2097/25 2097/25 2123/3 witness' [1] 1937/18 witnesses [3] 1935/3 2054/1 2054/2 woman [1] 1993/9 won [2] 2068/5 2068/24 wonder [3] 2045/5 2045/10 2063/21 WONG [1] 1933/20 word [7] 1984/6 1999/20 2000/2 2027/5 2027/7 2065/25 2066/1 words [18] 1947/1 1948/23 1963/10 1968/8 1972/17 1983/2 1984/12 1984/18 1986/10 2012/15 2022/4 2052/10 2084/2 2104/10 2110/6 2110/24 2110/25 2111/1 works [2] 2027/18 2055/22 world [5] 1938/13 1948/24 2017/12

# W world... [2] 2034/21 2048/11 worried [4] 1950/9 1959/13 1959/22 1960/8

worries [1] 2023/16 worry [2] 1936/23 2096/15 worse [2] 2047/13 2060/16

worst [1] 2032/21 worth [1] 2021/24

wow [2] 2093/24 2094/5

wrap [5] 2017/10 2065/20 2066/20 2104/5 2104/10

2104/5 2104/10 Wray [1] 2022/8 wrestle [1] 2063/13

write [7] 1936/14 1940/4 2057/3 2057/14 2057/15 2059/2 2065/4

writes [1] 2056/22

written [5] 1992/24 2015/22 2015/23 2111/14 2115/16

wrongdoing [2] 1950/3 1950/4 wrote [11] 2016/5 2049/22 2050/6 2050/7 2050/13 2050/25 2051/2 2053/19 2056/1 2065/5 2065/7 Wuhan [2] 1947/16 1970/5

## X

Xiao [2] 1966/13 1996/15 Xiao Jun [1] 1996/15 Xin [2] 2077/3 2077/7 Xinzi [4] 1950/1 2026/22 2038/2 2042/24 Xinzi Xu [1] 2042/24 Xu [194] Xu Jin [51] 1937/24 1938/2 1938/5 1938/9 1938/14 1938/17 1938/19 1938/23 1939/6 1940/22 1941/2 1941/22 1941/23 1942/1 1942/3 1943/5 1944/2 1945/3 1945/7 1945/14 1945/24 1945/25 1946/2 1946/24 1946/24 1947/15 1947/25 1948/1 1948/4 1948/4 1948/8 1948/14 1948/22 1948/25 1949/8 1949/15 1949/17 1949/25 1950/13 1951/14 1951/16 1987/3 1987/4 1987/14 1987/24 1988/19 1988/24 1992/4 1995/4 2026/22 2090/22 Xu Jin's [35] 1938/12 1938/14 1938/25 1942/3 1942/6 1944/15 1944/15 1945/1 1945/3 1945/19 1945/22 1946/18 1946/19 1946/23 1947/10 1947/14 1947/19 1947/20 1947/21 1948/3 1948/5 1948/9 1948/12 1949/7 1949/12 1949/13 1949/16 1949/18 1950/19 1951/12 1988/5 1988/13 1989/6 1993/20 2002/9 Xu Qin [1] 1947/15 Xu Xinzi [3] 1950/1 2026/22 2038/2 Xu's [4] 1944/19 1956/8 2001/2 2045/1

### γ

Yahoo [1] 2073/10 Yan [27] 1943/8 1947/22 1952/5 1963/3 1963/9 1975/3 1995/12 1995/13 2003/19 2003/23 2004/6 2004/12 2004/19 2026/13 2041/3 2043/16 2045/6 2082/1 2083/20 2084/13 2087/20 2089/11 2089/16 2089/19 2098/16 2104/25 2105/1

Yan's [3] 19<mark>44/45</mark>957/2 2117/11 Yang [1] 2026/20 year [6] 1959/18 2032/25 2036/2 2045/14 2051/15 2117/17 years [26] 1937/24 1938/20 1946/20 1951/3 1952/19 1968/2 1986/13 1987/4 1989/7 1993/11 2025/20 2025/20 2046/16 2048/5 2049/1 2050/16 2051/15 2051/22 2053/19 2055/25 2056/11 2056/15 2060/24 2064/17 2105/7 2116/16 yelled [1] 2007/15 yelling [1] 2057/6 yellow [1] 2100/4 yesterday [8] 1937/2 2008/14 2015/7 2059/16 2072/18 2073/19 2093/25

2122/1 Yong [183] 1939/9 1940/20 1940/24 1941/2 1941/3 1941/4 1941/6 1941/17 1942/4 1942/8 1942/13 1942/17 1942/25 1943/2 1946/12 1949/17 1949/22 1955/8 1955/10 1955/21 1956/2 1956/4 1956/11 1956/14 1956/22 1962/18 1966/24 1967/9 1967/14 1967/18 1969/3 1969/4 1969/8 1969/9 1969/10 1969/12 1969/12 1969/13 1969/14 1969/15 1969/19 1969/23 1969/25 1970/3 1970/11 1971/2 1971/5 1971/5 1971/6 1971/7 1971/11 1971/14 1971/21 1972/3 1972/6 1972/9 1972/14 1972/23 1973/12 1973/14 1973/18 1974/6 1974/12 1975/14 1979/12 1979/13 1987/21 1988/1 1988/3 1988/5 1988/7 1988/9 1992/6 1993/5 2069/8 2069/25 2070/3 2070/7 2070/21 2070/24 2071/8 2071/17

2080/17 2080/24 2081/1 2081/3 2081/4 2081/6 2081/6 2081/10 2081/17 2082/10 2082/18 2082/20 2082/21 2082/23 2083/2 2083/4 2083/9 2083/10 2083/15 2083/18

2071/20 2071/24 2072/3 2072/3

2072/24 2073/3 2073/7 2073/14

2074/25 2075/8 2075/19 2076/17

2076/18 2077/6 2077/13 2077/18

2077/25 2079/6 2079/9 2080/4

2083/18 2083/22 2084/2 2084/2 2084/18 2085/3 2086/17 2086/20 2087/19 2087/23 2088/4 2088/6 2088/12 2088/14 2088/24 2089/2

2089/12 2089/15 2089/18 2090/14 2090/22 2091/9 2095/7 2095/10 2095/16 2095/20 2095/21 2095/25 2096/2 2096/4 2096/5 2096/7 2096/20

2096/2 2096/4 2096/5 2096/7 2096 2096/25 2098/10 2098/12 2100/4 2100/5 2100/18 2100/18 2100/23 2101/8 2101/11 2101/18 2101/21 2102/11 2102/15 2102/22 2103/2

2103/3 2103/9 2103/13 2103/14 2106/6 2106/24 2107/10 2116/21 2117/1 2117/4 2117/22 2118/12 Yong Zhu [50] 1992/6 1993/5 2080/4

2080/17 2080/24 2081/3 2082/10 2082/20 2082/21 2082/23 2083/2 2083/4 2083/9 2083/10 2083/15 2083/18 2083/18 2083/22 2084/2 2084/18 2087/19 2087/23 2088/4 2088/6 2088/24 2089/2 2089/12 2089/15 2089/18 2090/14 2095/20 2095/25 2096/2 2096/4 2096/5 2096/20 2098/12 2100/18 2100/18 2100/23 2101/8 2101/11 2101/18 2102/22 2103/2 2103/3 2103/9 2103/13 2103/14 2107/10 Yong Zhu's [6] 2081/10 2082/18 2084/2 2086/20 2088/12 2088/14 Yong's [5] 1970/8 1970/10 1970/15 2116/9 2118/6 YORK [11] 1933/1 1933/4 1933/14

YORK [11] 1933/1 1933/4 1933/14 1933/15 1968/20 2021/3 2033/13 2033/13 2046/4 2048/9 2062/21 young [2] 1972/18 2061/4 younger [2] 1947/18 1960/6

Your Honor [22] 2024/8 2032/3 2041/6 2065/10 2065/21 2066/12 2068/8 2069/18 2075/12 2076/4 2076/9 2078/9 2078/20 2079/13 2080/20 2084/23 2085/1 2086/2 2090/3 2108/9 2119/4 2122/2

yourself [10] 1938/11 1997/21 1998/16 2014/22 2028/18 2030/1 2034/4 2059/15 2065/19 2111/11 yourselves [4] 2054/12 2055/25 2062/3

2111/10 Yu [1] 2026/22 Yu Fang [1] 2026/22 Yup [1] 2121/10

## Ζ

Zebin [2] 2042/9 2068/22 zero [5] 2055/21 2059/22 2059/24 2067/5 2067/7 Zheng [58] 1933/19 1939/9 1950/16

1950/19 1951/5 1951/17 1960/12 1960/15 1960/18 1960/25 1961/4 1961/6 1961/10 1961/19 1961/24 1962/13 1962/23 1966/25 1967/24 1984/20 1984/23 1985/1 1985/5 1985/6 1985/11 1985/14 1985/21 1985/23 1985/25 1986/11 1987/8 1988/23 1989/1 1989/4 1989/8 2069/6 2090/10 2099/2 2111/13 2111/22

2112/21 2112/22 2112/24 2113/8 2113/21 2114/14 2114/21 2114/23 2114/24 2115/12 2115/4 2115/13

2115/19 2115/22 2115/23 2115/24 2115/25 2116/4

Zheng's [1] 1960/10 Zhu [263]

Zhu Feng [1] 2001/13 Zhu Jin's [1] 1984/3

Zhu Yong [18] 1939/9 1941/2 1941/3 1941/4 1941/6 1941/17 1942/4 1942/8 1942/13 1942/17 1949/17 1971/11 1987/21 1988/1 1988/3 1988/5 1988/7

1988/9 Zhu's [13] 1994/20 2005/3 2042/19 2071/20 2071/24 2081/4 2081/10 2082/18 2084/2 2086/17 2086/20 2088/12 2088/14

zoomed [1] 1976/18